

THE SOLICITORS' JOURNAL & REPORTER. 883

The Solicitors' Journal & Reporter.

VOLUME XV.

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—Town, 26s., Country 28s.; with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d., half law calf, 4s. 6d.

All Letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer, though not necessarily for publication.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Provinces, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, NOVEMBER 5, 1870.

THE POLICE HAVE BEGUN AGAIN to put in force the law against betting houses, and the result has been several convictions by Mr. Vaughan on Tuesday last for this offence. There has also been discussion of the subject in the daily papers, the usual references to Tattersall's, and the display in many cases of much ignorance of law. Betting, it must always be remembered, is not illegal here as in some states of America. Bets cannot be enforced as contracts (8 & 9 Vict. c. 109, s. 18), but to make or to pay a bet or any number of bets is no offence against the law. Although betting is not illegal, betting houses are rendered illegal by 16 & 17 Vict. c. 109, the preamble to which recites that harm has been done "by the opening of betting houses, and the receiving of money in advance by the owners or occupiers of such houses on their promises to pay money on events of horse-races," &c. The statute then enacts, by section 1, that no house, office, &c., &c., shall be opened, used, &c., &c., for the purpose of the owner, occupier, &c., &c., or any person using the same, or any agent of such persons "betting with persons resorting thereto." The statute then renders owners, occupiers, &c., &c., of such houses liable to penalties. This section governs the whole Act. No house that does not fall within its provisions is illegal as a betting house, no matter how much betting goes on there. It is also to be noticed that "persons resorting" to such houses, as distinguished from the owners, occupiers, or persons using the same, or their agents, are not liable to any penalty at all. Simply to go to such houses and bet there with the owners, &c., is, therefore, no offence.

The law on this point is clear enough, although it seems to be but little understood, and we fear that the decision of Mr. Vaughan as reported in the *Times* of last Wednesday will not throw much light on the subject. The charge in that case was against a number of persons for using certain premises known as the "Knightsbridge Exchange" as a betting house, and there was also a charge against the occupier of the premises. It seems that a "Knightsbridge Exchange" was a betting club

which used to hold its meetings at an address in Brompton. There was an annual subscription and election of members. The evidence as stated in the newspaper report is very vague, but we assume (although we are not sure that we are right in doing so) that the occupier of these premises or his agents, or persons by his permission or with his knowledge, and other persons using these premises betted with the members of the club who resorted to the place, and that money was deposited there by the members who made such bets. The betting of the members, therefore, was not confined to simple betting with one another.

On these facts Mr. Vaughan convicted the defendants, and there can be no doubt that they had infringed the statute if they occupied or used the premises for the purpose "of betting with persons resorting thereto." Serjeant Ballantine, for the defendants, referred to Tattersall's, and said that the "Knightsbridge Exchange" was a betting club like Tattersall's, and that if the one was illegal the other must be also. Mr. Vaughan is reported to have said that "the Knightsbridge Exchange was an association of persons . . . that there were upwards of 2,000 members, and there appeared to be no limit to the number. The subscription of five shillings a-year was so trifling, and the manner in which a member was said to be elected so formal that he had no hesitation in deciding that the 'Knightsbridge Exchange' was a betting-house within the meaning of the Act." It is clear that this *ratio decidendi* is wrong, although the decision is very likely right. Whether or not there was any *bond fide* club in existence, and whether the defendants were members of such club or not, and whether the subscription of the club was high or low, the entrance easy or difficult, has nothing to do with the case. The question was the house opened, used, &c., for the purpose of the defendants as owners, occupiers, or persons using the house "betting with persons resorting thereto?" This is the only question, and it is to be regretted that it should appear that there is any other ground for the magistrate's decision.

The suggestion thrown out by Serjeant Ballantine in argument, that Tattersall's is an illegal association, deserves notice, as there is so much misapprehension on the point. If, as we believe is the case, the members of Tattersall's simply bet there with one another, and there is no owner, occupier, &c., of, or persons using, the premises, with whom they bet, the establishment is not within 16 & 17 Vict. c. 109, and is therefore legal. If the betting is not confined to the members amongst themselves, but is transacted with any owner, occupier, &c., the establishment is illegal. The law is clear, and the only question that can be raised is as to the facts of the case. Whether or not the law ought to be in this state is an entirely different question, and one well worthy of the consideration of the Legislature. The administrators of the law, however, have only to deal with 16 & 17 Vict. c. 109, and betting that does not come within that statute is not illegal.

WILL A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS issue at the instance of a person in confinement in India? This important question has been recently raised before the High Court of Calcutta under the following circumstances:—Ameer Khan, a Mahomedan merchant in Calcutta, was on the 10th of July, 1869, arrested at his own house, and carried to Gya, 289 miles from Calcutta, where he was imprisoned in the common gaol. Two days later, Hashmahad Khan, another Mahomedan merchant, was arrested and taken to Patna, 396 miles from Calcutta. On the 1st of August, 1870, motions were made in the High Court of Calcutta, before Mr. Justice Norman, for writs of *habeas corpus* on behalf of both Ameer Khan and Hashmahad Khan, and a rule *nisi* was granted on both sides. On the 10th of August, the Advocate-General and other counsel showed cause against the rules, and Mr. Chisholm Anstey and other counsel supported them. The arguments occupied six days, and judgment was reserved. On the 29th of August Mr. Justice Norman delivered a long and lucid judgment.* He decided that no writ of *habeas corpus* ought to issue, and therefore discharged the rule in both cases. As the matter is one of importance, and one which will in all probability ultimately come before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, we propose briefly to mention the grounds on which Mr. Justice Norman rested his decision. In the first place he stated that the *Habeas Corpus* Act has been (except as to certain parts thereof) introduced into India, and that the Supreme Court had therefore, in cases which he quoted, issued writs of *habeas corpus*. This being so, the jurisdiction of the High Court (in which are now vested the powers of the Supreme Court) to issue such writs is unquestionable; and this is important, because by 25 Vict. c. 20 a writ of *habeas corpus* cannot issue from an English court into a colony or foreign possession of the Crown where there are courts of justice having authority to issue such writs. Therefore, an English writ of *habeas corpus* could not now be issued to India as it could have been before 1862.

But if the High Court of Calcutta can issue writs of *habeas corpus*, why did Mr. Justice Norman discharge the rule in the case of Ameer Khan? Because there exists in India an Act of the Legislative Council which is equivalent to a perpetual suspension of the *Habeas Corpus* Act as regards persons arrested by the Government. By Regulation III. of 1818 of the Code of Bengal (and there are similar regulations in the Codes of Madras and Bombay), after reciting that "the security of the British dominions from foreign hostility and from internal commotion occasionally render it necessary to place under personal restraint individuals against whom there may not be sufficient ground to institute any judicial proceeding, or where such proceeding may not be adapted to the nature of the case, or may for other reason be inadvisable or improper, a warrant of commitment of any such individual is authorised to be issued by the Governor-General in Council. This Regulation is confirmed by Act III. of 1858 of the Legislative Council of India, which enacts that the provisions of Regulation III. of 1818 shall be in force within the local limits of the Supreme Court of Calcutta. This, says Mr. Justice Norman, "applies to all persons within the local limits, whether European British subjects, or persons living within the local limits under the protection of and subject to English law." The joint effect then of the Regulation and the Act is that the *Habeas Corpus* Act is perpetually suspended in India as regards persons arrested by the Government. It was argued on behalf of Ameer Khan that the Regulation and the Act were alike void as being *ultra vires* of the Indian Legislature. This is an important question. The Act 3 & 4 Will. 4, c. 85, which created and gave legislative powers to the Governor-General in Council, expressly provided that the Governor-General in Council should not have power to make

any laws or regulations affecting the prerogatives of the Crown or the authority of Parliament, or any part of the unwritten laws or constitution of the United Kingdom whereon may depend the allegiance of any person to the Crown. It was argued then that the Regulation and Act are void as being contrary to the unwritten law of the United Kingdom. This objection was overruled by Mr. Justice Norman, who held that the Regulation and Act were not *ultra vires*, and consequently not void.

THE PRESENT RULE OF INTERNATIONAL LAW, under which a neutral power is not required to restrain, or held responsible for, a traffic in contraband carried on by her own subjects, is rendered so clear by Wheaton and Kent (*vide*, 14 S. J. 945), and others, that it is impossible to render it any clearer. The writer of a letter in yesterday's *Times* cites one or two German writers on the matter, and among them Dr. Bluntschli, of Heidelberg, from whose "Modern International Law" he takes (*inter alia*) the following passage:—

"He who conveys contraband of war to a belligerent exposes himself to the risk of capture. But he only injures the war interests of the one party, and comes, so far, under its rights of war. The neutral state has no occasion on its side also to hinder the furnishing of contraband of war."

Now Dr. Bluntschli was an unfortunate writer to cite upon the point, because, though undoubtedly an able writer, he happens to be one of those who cannot always resist the temptation of laying down the law, not as it is, but as he thinks it ought to be; and if the correspondent of the *Times* had gone on to the next section (766), he would have found in the note (we take the original) these words:—

"Man darf dem neutralen Staat nicht zumuthen, dass er die Verschickung von Waffen im einzelnen und Kleinen verhindere. . . . Anders verhält es sich mit der zusehung im Grossen. Darin liegt durchweg eine thatsächliche Förderung einer Kriegspartei und meistens auch eine kriegerische Beihilfe. Insofern hat der neutrale Staat, um seine Nichtbetheiligung am Kriege ausser Zweifel zu stellen, ein Interesse, und soweit die absicht der Kriegshülfe mindestens wahrscheinlich ist, die Pflicht, der Ausführung solcher Sendung entgegenzutreten."

That is to say, that if the trade become so wholesale as to be a serious thing to either belligerent, the neutral should stop it. Such a proposition as this is utterly unwarranted by any precedent or authority; and it is difficult to imagine a vaguer rule or one which could be more utterly impracticable. It is not too much to say that with such a rule it would be in the power of any belligerent to draw any neutral into a *casus belli* within a fortnight. Happily there is no such rule, and it is to be hoped there never will be. It is only by preserving clear, sharp definitions in these matters that confusion and misunderstanding can be avoided.

WE HAVE REPORTED during the last few weeks several cases in the Court of Bankruptcy in which the learned registrars, following the decision of Lord Justice James in *Ex parte Dimond, Re Williams* (18 W. R. 1123), have refused to restrain proceedings in bankruptcy by a creditor, simply upon the ground that the debtor has presented a petition for liquidation by arrangement. These decisions are perfectly sound, and cannot be too generally known.

The intention of the Bankruptcy Act is quite clear. It gives to the general body of creditors assembled at a meeting duly convened, the right to elect between liquidation by arrangement and bankruptcy; and after the meeting has been held and has decided in favour of liquidation, any proceeding by a creditor, whether at law or in bankruptcy, may very properly be stayed. But the presentation of a petition for liquidation is the act of the debtor alone, with which the creditors have nothing to do; and to stay bankruptcy proceedings simply because

* *Vide* Report of the Proceedings, by C. C. Macrae, barrister-at-law.—"Englishman" Press, Calcutta, 1870.

such a petition has been presented would be to make over to the debtor the option which the Act has given to the creditor.

WE PRINT IN ANOTHER COLUMN the rule which the judges made on the first day of term under the new Juries Act. It will be seen that the judges have adopted the course which we suggested last week, and, leaving other points for future consideration, have made a rule to meet the one point in reference to which an immediate difficulty would have arisen at the present sittings—viz., provision of the fund for payment of the common jurors. The sum to be deposited is to be £3. This sum at first sight seems large, but upon examination it will probably be found not too large. It assumes that with thirty-six jurors in attendance six causes will be disposed of per day. Probably three full juries are seldom in attendance at the same time. Six is a considerable number of causes to dispose of, if only those which are called on are counted, and probably the deposit, which need not be paid until the cause is called on, will never be paid in any others. As the effect of the new Act will evidently be to diminish the difference in expense between special and common juries, it is probable that the proportion of special jury cases to common will now be larger than hitherto.

A FEW NOTES ON THE MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY ACT.

We have already, in the course of our comments on the legislative results of last session, discussed (see 14 S. J. 974) the general object and scope of this Act. The great importance of the enactment is a sufficient excuse to us for again referring to the subject; and we purpose this time to examine more minutely one or two of its details.

We desire to draw attention, in the first place, to sections 3, 4, and 5. These sections present an instance of ambiguity of language which will probably ere long become the subject of judicial decision. Section 3 provides that any married woman may make an application to the Bank of England that any sum of stock (being not less than £20) to which she is entitled may be made to stand in the books of the Bank of England in the name of the married woman as a married woman entitled to her separate use. The section then provides that, on such entry being made, the same sum "shall be deemed to be the separate property of such woman, and shall be transferred, and the dividends paid as if she were an unmarried woman." Sections 4 and 5 contain similar provisions with respect to the property of married women in joint stock companies and in friendly and other societies. The question which arises upon the above italicised words is this: Does the Act under the above-mentioned circumstances deprive the husband of his right, after his wife's death, to her stock and other property as administrator? There can be little doubt that such was not the intention of the Legislature. Yet the Act contains no words limiting its operation to the life of the married woman in question; and if the literal and full force of the words is to be taken, it seems difficult to stop short of the conclusion that the husband's right as administrator is excluded. Nevertheless, we think that such would not be the construction upheld by the Courts. The tendency of modern decisions is to allow the scope and general object of a statute to override the particular words employed; and to refuse to construe ambiguous expressions in such a manner as to lead to results which were never intended by the Legislature (compare for instance *Chorlton v. Lings*, 17 W. R. 284). Independently of this, the present question presents features which point to the conclusion that the true construction of the Act is to hold that it does not affect the husband's right as administrator to his deceased wife. The scope and object of the Act appear to be to place the property of married women in certain specified cases in the same

position as if it were settled to the separate use of the married woman, in the usual manner. The words "separate use," "separate property," run throughout the Act. Now it is the well-known rule of equity that a woman may freely dispose of her separate property either during her lifetime or by her will; but that if she dies intestate her surviving husband is entitled to all such property either in his marital right or as administrator, according as the property may be in possession or in action. Now the stock in question is expressly declared to be the separate property of the married woman (section 3); and it would seem to follow that it will be subject to all the ordinary incidents of separate property. Unless, therefore, the wife dispose of it in her lifetime, or by testamentary writing, it will belong to the husband. This seems the more clear when it is considered that, as the stock in question is a *chose in action*, it must necessarily be transferred in the first place to the wife's administrator. Now the ordinary law of administration is in no way affected by the Married Women's Property Act. The husband will therefore continue entitled to be his deceased wife's administrator, and as such will be entitled to the stock in question. It may be argued that the Act makes him a trustee for the wife's statutory next of kin; but this is obviously a more difficult contention. And it may well be suggested that the words of the Act are literally complied with by a transfer of the stock to the administrator of the person in whose name it stands, be that administrator who he may. We think, therefore, that the husband's right in this respect is not affected by the Act, but it would have been better had the Act been more distinct in this respect. A similar question may be raised as to section 2 (relating to deposits in savings banks). The language of this section, however, differs slightly from that of section 3 above cited, and the variation is in favour of the preservation of the husband's existing rights as administrator of his wife. If, therefore, we are right in our argument upon section 3, the same conclusion would follow, *a fortiori*, with regard to section 2.

Section 11 of the Act enables a married woman to maintain an action *in her own name* for the recovery not only of any property by the Act declared to be her separate property, but also of "any property belonging to her before marriage, and which her husband shall by writing under his hand have agreed with her shall belong to her after marriage as her separate property." It is to be observed that this section applies as well to women married *before* as to those married *after* the passing of the Act. Its provisions therefore extend to *all* married women without exception. It should be observed, also, that the section enables a married woman to sue in her own name in respect of any property which her husband may by her marriage settlement have agreed shall be her separate property. For such an agreement would be in writing under the hand of the husband, as required by the Act. If, however, such property has been transferred to trustees (as is usually, but not invariably, the case) we conceive that the Act would not apply, and that the action must be brought in the names of the trustees, as before.

The protection given to a wife in respect of such property as above-mentioned is of a very stringent character. The section goes on to provide that the married woman "shall have in her own name the same remedies both civil and criminal against all persons whomsoever for the protection and security of such property as if the same belonged to her as an unmarried woman." Under these words it seems to us to be clear, that a wife may prosecute her husband for stealing her separate property. This perhaps is a case which is not likely to occur very often; but there is another result of the section which is of more immediate importance to lawyers. Does the section enable a wife to file a bill in Chancery in her own name, without the intervention of a next friend? Hitherto, of course, the rule has been that a married woman can under no circumstances, sue at common law.

In equity, she can sue, but only through the intervention of a next friend (*Picard v. Hine*, 18 W. R. 75). After the passing of the Act, it is clear that a married woman can sue at common law in her own name. The words of the section above cited are so far express. But does the statute further enable a married woman to sue in equity in her own name also? It would be a curious anomaly if it were the case that a wife could sue at common law in her own name, but required the intervention of a next friend to enable her to sue in equity. Yet, such must be the law, unless the statute be understood to alter the existing practice of the Court of Chancery in this respect. And the statute appears to us to have this effect. It is true that the expression above cited—"maintain an action," may seem to point to an action at common law only. But when the section goes on to say that the married woman "shall have in her own name the same remedies both civil and criminal as if such property belonged to her as an unmarried woman," it is surely impossible to argue that equitable remedies are not included. It would seem, therefore, that henceforward a married woman will be able to file a bill in Chancery without the intervention of a next friend. This, however, will be the case only where the bill relates to separate property of the married woman, which has become hers in the various modes pointed out in the Act. It does not apply to suits relating to property which is vested in trustees for the separate use of a married woman in the ordinary manner.

It is observable that, although under certain circumstances the Act enables a married woman to sue, it does not, except in the case of ante-nuptial debts (see section 12) make her liable to be sued in any manner in which she is not now liable. It would appear, therefore, that all suits against a married woman in respect of her separate property, must be brought in the Court of Chancery. And this will equally be the case whether the property in question became the separate property of the married woman by virtue of the provisions of the Act or otherwise.

It may not be out of place to notice that the marginal note to section 7 is inaccurate and is liable to mislead. It runs thus, "Personal property not exceeding £200 coming to a married woman to be her own." A reference to the section will show that it is only when the property is derived under a deed or will that the limit of £200 attaches; property to which a woman married after the passing of the Act becomes entitled as *next of kin* of an intestate, whatever its amount, will be held for her separate use.

In conclusion the following note may be useful:—It is highly important to distinguish carefully between those clauses of the Act which are confined to women married after the passing of the Act, and those which extend to all married women whomsoever. It is also important to distinguish between those sections which require some formality, such as a special declaration or notice, to be gone through before the statute applies, and those which extend to all cases whatsoever. The following are the sections which apply only to the case of women married after the passing of the Act:—sections 7, 8, 12. The remainder of the Act extends to all married women whomsoever. The following also are the sections which require the performance of some previous formality before the Act attaches:—sections 3, 4, 5, 10, 11. The residue of the statute applies in all cases, without any such previous act.

HOW TO DISPOSE OF SEWAGE.

The various legal difficulties inherent in this question, when they are brought under our notice by the reports, deserve some attention for the simple reason that so many public bodies in every part of the kingdom have been engaged for years, and are still engaged, in attempts to solve it, with varying success. This problem, in nine cases out of ten, takes the following shape:—Given a

certain quantity of noxious and offensive matter, how to rid ourselves of it by discharging it within our neighbour's borders, so that our neighbour may have no remedy against us either at law or in equity. What then is the legal position of a public body engaged in the drainage of a district under parliamentary powers, where the result of their operations is the creation of a nuisance at common law?

Where the Legislature gives a general license to do a particular act without any provision that the doer is to be liable for the consequences, persons aggrieved by the necessary result of the act being done may be without a remedy, inasmuch as the authority of the Legislature for the act can be pleaded by the doer. In this sense there may be a wrong without a remedy, the well known maxim notwithstanding; and the aggrieved person's only course is to appeal to the Legislature to rectify the concession they have made. A reference to one or two cases will illustrate our meaning. Where the trustees of a turnpike trust, in execution of a statutory power, filled up the gap between two hills, and carried the highway on an embankment past the plaintiff's lodge in such a manner that he was unable to drive out, the decision was that the trustees, who had not acted oppressively, were not liable in damages, for that the Act omitted to provide a remedy in such a case (*Boulton v. Crowther*, 2 B. & C. 703). So, too, where horses were frightened by the locomotives employed on a railway in pursuance of an Act, and the railway company were indicted for the nuisance, the Court of King's Bench decided that the nuisance, as being the necessary result of the use of locomotives in the manner sanctioned by the Legislature, was not actionable (*R. v. Pease*, 4 B. & Ad. 30). And in a late case involving the same principle (*Attorney-General v. Conservators of the River Thames*, 11 W. R. 163, 1 H. & M. 1), Lord Hatherley, when Vice-Chancellor, held that inasmuch as the erection of a pier in the river must needs be an injury to some one, and Parliament had sanctioned the erection of such a pier, no private person could be heard to complain that he was the person in front of whose premises the pier was erected.

There is a distinction, as the same learned judge pointed out in *Attorney-General v. Metropolitan Board of Works* (11 W. R. 820, 1 H. & M. 298), between parliamentary powers to do acts which necessarily involve a nuisance, and powers which may be exercised without giving rise to a nuisance. Powers of the latter class must be so exercised as not to give rise to a nuisance; in the case of powers of the former class the Legislature is presumed to have regarded the balance of convenience (*R. v. Russell*, 6 B. & C. 566), and the persons whose duty it is to execute the power are shielded from all responsibility for the consequences, provided they have not exceeded their powers (*Plate Glass Company v. Meredith*, 4 I. R. 794), though they are not relieved from the obligation to use reasonable care that, in doing the act, no unnecessary damage be done (*Mersey Dock Trustees v. Gibbs*, 14 W. R. 872, L. R. 1 E. & I. App. 112). In *Attorney-General v. Committee of Visitors of Colney Hatch Lunatic Asylum* (17 W. R. 242), *Bolton v. Crowther* (*ubi sup.*), was cited in support of a contention that the Legislature, in empowering visiting justices to build a lunatic asylum, impliedly authorised the disposal of its sewage in a manner complained of by a neighbouring Board of Health. But Lord Hatherley and Selwyn, L.J., negatived this very decidedly, the former saying that "it could not be construed from the power to build a large building, that all the refuse from the house was to be thrown on the neighbouring ground."

If the Legislature expressly empowered a public body to drain into a particular river, without any provision that they should be liable for the consequences, it might fairly be contended that persons who were injured thereby could not complain, provided the operations were carried on in conformity with the local Act, and so as not to occasion any unnecessary nuisance; and it would be assumed that Parliament, by omitting to pro-

vide a remedy, had deliberately preferred the interests of the district to be drained to the interest of the district upon which the drainage was to be discharged. Such a case, however, has not occurred. The *Leeds case* (*Attorney-General v. Corporation of Leeds*, V.C.J., 18 W. R. 517, on appeal L. R. 5 Ch. 583, 19 W. R. 19) was an information at the relation of the landowners on the banks of the river Aire, below Leeds, for the purpose of restraining the defendants from polluting the river by pouring into it the sewage of the borough in an unpurified and undeodorised state. The Local Improvement Act expressly authorised the corporation to drain into the river. The case thus differed from the *Birmingham case* (6 W. R. 811, 4 K. & J. 528), where this express authority was wanting. If the case had stopped there, the principle of *R. v. Pease* might have been applicable, as the Lord Chancellor pointed out (L. R. 5 Ch. 591). The Local Improvement Act incorporated, as is usual in these cases, so much of the Towns Improvement Clauses Act, 1847, as relates to the drainage of towns. It did not incorporate the particular bundle of regulations, among which is section 107, which provides in effect that nothing in the Act contained shall authorise a nuisance; and it was accordingly contended, on behalf of the defendants, that section 107 did not apply, and that the corporation had express power to create the nuisance which passing filth into the river must occasion. The Court of appeal, however, affirming the decision of the Vice-Chancellor, held that section 107 did impliedly control the operations of the corporation. If, therefore, they were, on the one hand, empowered to drain into the river by the local Act, they were, on the other hand, forbidden to create a nuisance thereby by the general Act. An injunction was therefore awarded to protect the river from further pollution by the sewage of Leeds.

The above case establishes the important fact that public bodies who are invested with the general powers of the Towns Improvement Act, 1847, which relate to the making or maintaining the public sewers and the drainage of houses, take those powers subject to the general provision as to nuisance contained in section 107, which occurs in a wholly different part of the Act. But, on general principles, it would appear that, for a local Act of this character to relieve those who exercise its powers from the general provision applicable to all such bodies, that they shall conduct their works so as not to create a nuisance, plain and specific words would be needed. This the Vice-Chancellor intimated.

Another noticeable feature in the *Leeds case* was the lapse of time since the beginning of the evil. The Court was urged by the defendants to take into consideration that sixteen years had gone by since the sewer was completed, during all which time it had been pouring, with the knowledge of the relators, a continually increasing stream of filth into the river. If promptitude is successful and delay fatal anywhere, it is in proceedings in equity. But there are reasons why delay should not be imputed in cases of this class, where the Attorney-General sues on behalf of the public, as in the case of an ordinary plaintiff. "When any person finds that the Legislature has authorised a work to be done, he is not to assume that it will create a nuisance Until it is ascertained that the construction of the work will result in a nuisance, I do not see how any person could have sued. If he had, I apprehend the answer would have been, 'We have the power to do this by the Act, and you cannot restrain us from doing it, unless you can allege some grievance on the subject; and you cannot sue in the form of *quia timet*, because the Legislature seems to have contemplated there was a possibility of that being done which they had authorised to be done.' I think, therefore, that is a complete answer to the question of delay" (*Per Lord Hatherley*, L. R. 5 Ch. 594). The fact then that an act is done under the authority of the Legislature not only justifies a certain amount of delay before instituting proceedings to abate a consequent nuisance, but even renders it incumbent on an

aggrieved party to wait. This exception to the ordinary rules of the Court as to delay and acquiescence, where the offending party purports to act under legislative authority, is important to be borne in mind. And if some delay be excusable in the case of a private plaintiff, much more is it excusable in the case of the Attorney-General suing on behalf of the public. In the *Bradford Canal case* (*Attorney-General v. Proprietors of the Bradford Canal*, 15 W. R. 579, L. R. 2 Eq. 71) the pollution of the canal had been going on increasing during ten years and upwards, and the question of delay was much debated, owing to the public having submitted to the evil during that period. The Vice-Chancellor (Sir W. Page Wood), in granting an injunction against the proprietors of the canal, while admitting that delay might, in some cases, be a complete answer to an information, drew a distinction between the position of the Attorney-General and that of an ordinary plaintiff, saying "that, in cases of this kind, persons are obliged to wait for a considerable time before it can be ascertained that a case has arisen for them to put themselves in motion and come to the Court, is an argument which certainly applies more reasonably to the general public, whose interests are to be protected, than to a single individual, who may file a bill as soon as he is aggrieved." In this case, as in the *Leeds case*, the evil complained of was a continually increasing evil. Were it stationary, less latitude could be allowed.

RECENT DECISIONS.

EQUITY.

INSURANCE AGENT—COMMISSION ON PROFITS—BREACH OF CONTRACT.

Maclure's Claim, L.J., 18 W. R. 1122.

It was held in this case that the agent of an insurance company—who had entered into an agreement to act in that capacity for a term of years, in consideration of a fixed salary and a commission on the net profits of the business in every year—was not entitled to recover damages in respect of the loss of commission occasioned by the company going into voluntary liquidation before the expiration of the term, and thus ceasing to earn any profit upon which commission could be paid. It was contended on the part of the claimant that there was an implied contract on the part of the company to carry on business until the end of the term, as in a case at common law, where A. sold to B. his practice of a surgeon, in consideration of a sum paid down and an undertaking by B. to pay over one-fourth of the receipts of the practice for four years, and a contract on B.'s part to carry on the practice during the term was implied (*McIntyre v. Belcher*, 11 W. R. 839). The right to a share in the business, which was the subject of the contract in *McIntyre v. Belcher*, carries the right to say how the business shall be carried on; but the right to a commission on the profits of the business carries no such right, but leaves the principal unfettered, and if he chooses to earn no profits the agent has no right to complain. Whether in these cases a contract to carry on the business is to be implied or not must depend on whether the agent has, by the original contract, the right to control the principal in the way he carries on the business.

CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS—MORTMAIN ACT—TRUSTEES' DISCRETION.

Lewis v. Allenby, V.C.S., 18 W. R. 1127.

Something like a new point arose in this case. The testator bequeathed pure and impure personality in trust for division amongst any hospitals or charitable institutions in London or England as the trustees in their discretion should think fit. It was contended by the next of kin that the above bequest was void under the Mortmain Act, as regards the impure personality bequeathed,

but the Vice-Chancellor decided that as regards that portion of the bequest the trustees ought to exercise their discretion in favour of any hospital or charitable institution exempt from the Mortmain Act, of which there are several. The entire bequest was therefore supported, as a good charitable bequest. The principle is, that where a testator has indicated two courses of dealing with his property, one of which is according to law, and the other not, the executor shall take that course which is according to law. A charitable bequest is good, if it can by possibility be carried into effect without a breach of the Mortmain Act. Lord Hardwicke's observations as to this in *Soresby v. Hollins* (9 Mod. 221), were cited by the Vice-Chancellor. In *Soresby v. Hollins* a bequest of an annuity to a charity, to be secured by purchase of lands or otherwise, was determined to be valid by reason of the words "or otherwise," as indicating a mode whereby the intention might be effectuated without violating the statute. The Master of the Rolls followed this decision in *Dent v. Allcroft* (10 W. R. 184), where the bequest was to be applied in establishing a school—which pointed to the acquisition of land—or otherwise for school purposes, which removed all objection to the bequest. In *Lewis v. Allenby*, it became the duty of the trustees to marshal the assets comprised in the bequest, and divide the proceeds of the impure personality among such charities only as were capable of holding it.

REVIEWS.

The Common Law and Equity Practice of the County Courts, with the Scales of Costs and Fees, the New Rules, and the more important Forms. By GEORGE WASHINGTON HEYWOOD, Barrister-at-Law. London: W. Maxwell & Son: Manchester: Abel Heywood & Son. 1870.

The great aim of the author of this work seems to have been to keep down the size and the price. It may be carried in the pocket without inconvenience, and its price is only five shillings, which must be allowed to be moderate for a law book, if only it is worth having at all. It is not uncommon to find that cheap law books would be dear at a gift, owing to the mistakes into which they are apt to lead those who rely on them. This does not appear to be the case, however, with Mr. Heywood's book, which we decidedly recommend to the numerous class of practitioners who, while called upon to practise occasionally in the county courts, do not do so habitually, and therefore do not become thoroughly familiar with the ordinary practice of the courts. It does not contain much that would not be familiar to a constant practitioner in the county courts, except perhaps the chapters on the Equitable Jurisdiction, which probably has not yet become very familiar to any one. At the same time even to a constant practitioner, who wants to be able to quote the number of the rule or the section of the Act of Parliament applicable to any particular point, it will be useful to have this little book in the pocket or the bag. It is true that neither the Acts of Parliament nor the rules (except the last rules of May, 1870) are printed in *extenso*, but they are incorporated into the text, with references to the sections and numbers. The general index is very complete, and there are also tables of statutes and of repealed sections of statutes that will be found useful. Everything the book contains can be easily found. Whether it contains, as it professes to do, accurate information on all ordinary points can of course only be ascertained after considerable use of it in actual practice; but so far as we have been able to test it we have found it reliable. We ought to add that the scales of costs and fees seem very complete, a matter upon which occasional practitioners in the courts are especially likely to require information, though probably when they get it they may not be tempted to become anything else.

The Law of Salvage, as administered in the High Court of Admiralty and the County Courts; with the Principal Authorities, English and American, brought down to the present time, and an Appendix, containing Statutes, Forms, Table of Fees, &c. By EDWIN JONES, of Gray's Inn, Barrister-at-Law. London: Stevens & Haynes.

The law of salvage has hitherto generally been dealt with only in conjunction with other and more important

branches of law, but the book now before us is devoted exclusively to a consideration of this subject. This plan no doubt gives to the author ample scope for saying whatever is to be said about salvage; but, on the other hand, the subject is necessarily so limited that it seems hardly entitled to the dignity of a volume to itself. There are many objections to minute subdivision in the treatment of legal subjects, one of the most important of which is that it directly encourages an excessive reliance on isolated judicial decisions in preference to the general principles upon which those decisions are based. For this reason we dislike the method of treating law adopted by Mr. Jones. The object of the book, however, has been fairly carried out. The style and execution of the work is not superior to that of many of the smaller text-books on English law, but it is not worse. The pages contain the substance of the cited cases, arranged in a more or less orderly manner, and an unusual number of American decisions are given on points as to which the English and American law are more or less similar. No skill is shown in dealing with conflicting decisions or in deducing from a number of cases some guiding principle. The absence of this power appears very clearly in the chapter on "Unskilfulness" (p. 138 *et seq.*), where the confusion of the cases is very faithfully reflected in the text. There are some instances of want of care, as at pp. 7 and 8, where the facts of a case are stated, but the reference is omitted; and we notice one or two wrong references. On the whole, however, there seem to be but few errors of this sort.

After explaining the substantive law relating to salvage, the practice of the Court of Admiralty and of the county courts is shortly stated, and a collection of forms is given in the Appendix, together with the chief statutes bearing on the law of salvage. The book will be useful for those who may wish to know the law on salvage, and its usefulness is increased by a good index. We fear, however, that the demand for it will be but small, on account of the limited nature of its subject.

COURTS.

* * We are requested to state that the case of *Re Quiggin*, reported by us 14 S. J. 979, was adjudicated by Mr. J. W. Harden, the judge of the Birkenhead County Court, and not (as stated in our report) by Serjeant Wheeler.

QUEEN'S BENCH.

(In Banco.—Coram LORD CHIEF JUSTICE, and MELLOR, LUSH, and HANNEN, JJ.)

Nov. 2.—*The new jury rule.*

The Court did not sit before three o'clock.

On coming into court, the Lord Chief Justice said their lordships had been engaged in framing the new rule under the Jury Act of last session, which was the cause of the delay in commencing the business of term. The Act only came into operation that day, and this was the first opportunity the Court had had of meeting and discussing the subject.

HANNEN, J., then read the following rule:—"Whereas by the Juries Act, section 22, it is enacted as follows:—'Jurors shall be entitled to the following remuneration for their services, that is to say, every special juror when summoned for the purpose of trying special jury cases at the rate of £1 1s. for every day of his attendance. The remuneration of a juror when trying common jury cases shall be at the rate of 10s. for every day of his attendance. The above-mentioned remuneration shall be paid by the parties to the cause to be tried, and for that purpose each of the said parties shall deposit such sum of money as may be determined by any rule of the Court in which the cause is depending, and such deposit shall be made in such manner, at such times, and with such officer as the Court may prescribe.' Now, in order to provide a fund for such remuneration of the jurors when trying common jury cases in this court, this Court doth order that in all causes already entered and now standing for trial by common juries the plaintiff in each and every of such cause shall forthwith, and before the cause is tried, deposit a sum of £3 with the associate for the purpose of such remuneration of such jurors. That if the plaintiff make default in paying such deposit the other party in the cause may pay the same, and in default of the same being paid the cause shall be struck out, unless

the presiding judge shall otherwise order. And it is also ordered that until further order the plaintiff shall upon the entry of every cause pay a deposit of £3 to the associate for the purpose aforesaid, or the cause shall not be entered."

Election judge.

The Court have appointed Mr. Justice Lush from this court to be on the rota for the trial of election petitions during the ensuing year.

COURT OF BANKRUPTCY.

(Before Mr. Registrar ROCHE.)

Oct. 21.—*In re Thompson.*

Effect of omission to plead discharge.

In the case of a debtor named Thompson, whose affairs had been placed in liquidation, a question of some importance under the new Act was discussed. On the 9th July the first meeting under the petition was held, and the creditors resolved to accept a composition of two shillings and sixpence in the pound by instalments, payable at distant dates, and the resolution was subsequently confirmed. At the date of the petition a creditor for £50, holding a bill of exchange as security, did not appear by name in the list, but the bill was inserted as a liability to an unknown holder. The creditor consequently received no notice of the proceedings, but the first instalment of the composition was tendered to him in August, and he declined to accept it. On the 30th of September he issued a writ against the debtor, obtained judgment by default on the 11th of October, and issued execution. Thereupon, the debtor obtained from the Court an interim injunction restraining further proceedings.

Reed, for the plaintiff, showed cause against the enlargement of the injunction, relying on the *laches* of the defendant, who, he contended, was estopped from asking for the interference of the Court, inasmuch as he had not pleaded the discharge granted by the creditors under the petition for liquidation. He submitted that a debtor who neglected to plead his discharge as a bar to the proceedings instituted against him was estopped as under the old law, by the judgment, and that practice was also followed under the 192nd section in regard to deeds. The learned counsel quoted various authorities in support of his argument.

Doria, for the debtor, contended that the old practice did not now apply, and asked that the injunction should be continued.

The REGISTRAR said that, under the old practice, a debtor who neglected either to plead his certificate or his deed was estopped from avoiding the consequences of the judgment, and he was of opinion that the same principle prevailed with regard to a discharge granted in pursuance of a resolution passed by creditors under a petition for liquidation. As the debtor in this case had omitted to plead the discharge granted by the creditors, his Honour was of opinion that the injunction must be dissolved, but as the point was entirely new he should make no order as to costs.

Oct. 31.—*In re Coupland and Spence.*

Injunction.

The debtors presented a petition for liquidation on the 21st of October. On the 22nd a receiver was appointed, and the Court thereupon granted an interim injunction restraining proceedings commenced by the Staffordshire Financial Company (Limited) and other creditors.

Mr. Sedgwick now applied that the injunction should be extended until after the meeting of creditors (fixed for the 14th November).

Reed, on behalf of the Staffordshire Financial Company, asked that the injunction should be dissolved. Their writ was issued on the 12th October; a debtor's summons was granted on the 14th; on the 21st the petition was presented; and the receiver was appointed and an interim injunction granted on the 22nd. The case of *Ex parte Dimond, In re Williams* (18 W.R. 1123), had settled the point that a proceeding by a creditor, if it had priority of date, should be preferred to one commenced by the debtor; and that decision had been acted upon in subsequent cases. It was only where a preponderating majority of creditors desired it that the preference was given to the liquidation petition when it was presented after the institution of the bankruptcy proceedings. In either case the proceedings had a common object in view, viz., the administration of the debtor's estate.

Mr. Sedgwick, in reply, urged that, unless the injunction

were extended, the estate might be taken in execution by Mr. Reed's client.

The REGISTRAR said it was clear from the authorities that the Court would prefer a creditor's petition, especially where it had priority in point of time, to a petition by a debtor. There would be an order dissolving the injunction restraining the debtor's summons, with costs out of the estate, the creditor undertaking not to proceed with his action. This would give the creditor an opportunity of obtaining an adjudication if he thought fit, under which the available property would be equally distributed.

(Before Mr. Registrar BROUGHAM.)

Receiver's remuneration.

In the case of a debtor who had presented a petition for liquidation, a question arose as to the right of the receiver appointed under the proceedings to deduct the remuneration claimed by him from the moneys which had come into his hands before paying over the same.

The REGISTRAR said the course to be pursued was for the receiver to pass his accounts before the Court, including the remuneration claimed by him, so that the account would show the exact balance to be paid over. The Court took care to appoint responsible persons to the office of receiver, and, if necessary, security was required, so that there was very little danger of the funds being misapplied.

(Before Mr. Registrar SPRING-RICE.)

Nov. 3.—*Re Nokes and Carlisle.*

This was a first sitting under the bankruptcy of Messrs. W. F. Nokes and George Carlisle, solicitors, of 8, Finch-lane. It appeared that on the 9th June the debtors presented a petition for liquidation by arrangement, but at the first meeting held under those proceedings none of the creditors were willing to pass any resolution for liquidation, and a bankruptcy petition followed. The debts of the firm were estimated at £20,000, with assets of insignificant value, and it seemed that Mr. Nokes had not yet surrendered. The petitioning creditor was Mr. Gabriel Lindo, solicitor, of 12, King's-arms-yard, whose claim of £373 arose upon two bills of exchange drawn by the bankrupt upon Mr. Verrall Nunn, of the Variety Theatre, Horton, and in respect to which judgment has been recovered.

Several creditors attended the meeting, and some surprise was manifested at the small amount of the assets likely to be forthcoming. It was alleged that the failure might be attributed to losses upon certain speculative transactions in which the bankrupts had engaged.

Resolutions were passed for the appointment of Mr. Harry Brett, public accountant, of 150, Leadenhall-street, as trustee; and Messrs. G. Lindo, William Reeves, and H. M. Leslie were nominated to act as a committee of inspection.

Mr. G. Lindo is the solicitor to the proceedings.

COUNTY COURTS.

CAMBRIDGE.

Mr. EDMOND BEALES took his seat for the first time as Judge of the County Court at Cambridge on the 27th October, when the usual complimentary addresses were made.

Cockerell, as the only barrister present at the opening of the Court, said that in the absence of his senior he desired to congratulate his Honour upon his first appearance in the court at Cambridge. This was the heaviest court in the district, and the most important cases came before it. He was sure he expressed the sentiments of other members of the bar in saying that they would be most happy to render his Honour all the assistance possible. He might also say that he could indorse every word that had fallen at previous courts with regard to the late Judge Collyer. He could verify from experience his earnest and constant desire to administer impartial justice, his high qualification as a judge, and his kindness of disposition. He also sincerely joined in the expressions of condolence for the family of the late judge made by gentlemen at other courts. In this he was not only expressing his own feeling, but that of every professional gentleman attending the court.

Mr. Rance, as the senior attorney, having just entered, said that he had not at all anticipated that he should be called on to address the Court. He proceeded to make some general remarks on the mutual relations of suitors and judge.

Mr. BEALES, in acknowledging the cordial welcome he had received, is reported to have said that his con-

nection with the town and university enhanced the gratification consequent on being appointed to this circuit. As to what had been stated with reference to his learned and lamented predecessor, it had his hearty concurrence. He had the pleasure of Mr. Collyer's personal acquaintance in Vice-Chancellor Bruce's Court, where the late judge was a reporter. He felt perfectly convinced, from what he knew of his late friend, that he was quite competent to fill the position he held, and he trusted it would be his own fortune, after a few years' experience, to occupy to some extent the position Judge Collyer had held. He entirely concurred with what he had heard addressed to the bar some years ago by one of the most conscientious of equity judges, the late Lord Langdale, that the best assistance any judge could receive was to be found in the honour, integrity, and truthfulness, as well as the ability of those who practised before him. He had not the slightest doubt that it would be his good fortune to receive such support, both here (in his native town) and elsewhere, from those gentlemen who practised before him.

KINGS LYNN, NORFOLK.

(Before W. H. COOKE, Esq., Q.C.)

Oct. 26.—*Osborne v. Miller and Others.*

Equitable jurisdiction—28 & 29 Vict. c. 99—30 & 31 Vict. c. 142, s. 9.—*Costs*—*Specific performance*—*Agreement for lease*—*Waiver of right to call for title.*

By agreement, dated May, 1867, M. and partners agreed to take a lease of a public-house at a rack rent from Lady-day of that year from O. for a term of eight years. M. and partners entered into possession and remained therein, paying rent to O., until Lady-day, 1870. On a draft lease being tendered to their solicitor for perusal on their behalf he for the first time demanded of O. evidence of his title to let the premises.

Held, in a suit for specific performance of the agreement to execute a lease, that M. and partners had, by entering into possession and paying rent since 1867, waived their right to call for evidence of the proposed lessor's title.

Held, also, that the proper mode of estimating the value of leasehold property for the purpose of awarding costs on the higher or lower scale under the Act was to calculate the aggregate value of the rack rental for the remainder of the term.

In May, 1867, the defendants, brewers of Kings Lynn, entered into an agreement with the plaintiff, a brewer of St. Ives, to take a lease of a public-house in the latter town for a term of eight years from Lady-day, 1867. There was no premium paid or to be payable for the lease, and the rent was admitted to be a rack rent. The agreement provided that the lease when executed should contain the usual covenants on the part of the lessor for quiet enjoyment, &c., by the lessee, and as to the good title of the lessor. Under this agreement the defendants entered into possession, placed a tenant in the house and gave the usual notices of application for an ale-house licence under the Act of 9 Geo. 4. They shortly afterwards ejected this tenant and replaced him by another, and since the agreement was executed had in fact had several tenants successively in occupation of the house and paying rent to them. Ultimately the justices refused to renew the licence, and the defendants, who had, since 1867, paid the rent to the plaintiff, applied to him to take the house off their hands. This he refused to do, and his solicitor tendered to the defendants a draft lease for perusal by their solicitor on their behalf. This draft contained the usual covenants for title, quiet enjoyment, &c. The defendants' solicitor refused to peruse this draft until an abstract of the plaintiff's title had been furnished to the defendants and verified in the usual manner. This was refused and the present suit for specific performance of the agreement to execute a lease was instituted.

Poynter, for plaintiff.—The defendants are not entitled to call for evidence of their landlord's title. Even if the old rule did not apply, that a party who had adopted the relation of landlord and tenant between himself and the party of whom he held could not afterwards dispute his landlord's title, here there was a practical waiver by the defendants of their assumed right to call for evidence of title. They had acted inconsistently with the entertainment by them of any intention to call for such evidence. They had not only taken possession under the agreement, and continued to pay rent to the plaintiff, but had actually endeavoured to get the premises licensed as a public-house for their respective tenants, and it was only when they failed in those efforts that they sought to repudiate their bargain. The case of

Simpson v. Sudd (3 W. R. 118), was precisely in point, and the Lord Chancellor supplied a test which might always be applied. Did the conduct of the defendants tend to produce the impression that they never meant to ask for evidence of title? (*Haydon v. Bell*, 1 Beav. 337; *Kintrea v. Parston*, 1 H. & N. 357.) A distinction must be drawn between an agreement to buy, and an agreement to hire. Undoubtedly in an agreement to buy, where a valuable consideration was to be parted with, equity would protect a party from giving his money for a worthless article; but here there was no premium to be parted with, only the relation of lessor and lessee at a rack rent to be established for a limited term (*Souter v. Drake*, 3 Nev. & Man. 40). It was an admitted rule of law that a tenant could not dispute his landlord's title, and here the plaintiff was landlord *qua* the defendants. Any disturbance of the defendants' possession was provided against by the covenants for good title and quiet enjoyment.

Poland Adcock, for defendants.—The property was heavily mortgaged, and the plaintiff could not make out a title. A court of equity could not strain its powers to compel a man to enter into a contract of specialty which, from disclosed circumstances, could not be mutual. The plaintiff could not execute a lease, the property was not his to let. Besides, the house was no longer a public-house; the agreement was for the lease of a public-house. The plaintiff had now no public-house to let. The defendants would be bound down by the lease to keep the premises as a public-house. How could they do this when, from circumstances over which they had no control, the house had ceased to possess that character? It would be inequitable to compel them to enter into a covenant which it was impossible they could perform (*Moulton v. Snowball*, 5 L. T. 299). There is an implied covenant in an agreement for a lease that the lessor has a good title to let (*Stranks v. St. John*, 16 L. T. 283).

Mr. COOKE.—I must decree specific performance in this case. The defendants are not asked to do an impossibility, they are only asked to execute a lease. This they have contracted to do, and they must perform their contract. It would unsettle half the property in the kingdom if, because people found they had made a bad bargain, they could get out of it by questioning the title of their contractor at any indefinite time afterwards. The property may be mortgaged, but the plaintiff nevertheless is landlord so far as the defendants are concerned. As to the house not being a public-house now, to say nothing of that being perhaps attributable to the conduct of the undertenants of the defendants themselves, it is admitted that it was a public-house when they entered into the agreement, and in the contemplation of equity an act is done when it is agreed to be done. The lease will be as if executed in May, 1867. The defendants have by paying rent, putting in tenants, and applying several times for a licence, adopted the agreement, and, therefore, the lease; and even if, as Mr. Adcock contends, in a contract of that kind there is an implied term to adduce evidence of title—a principle which recent decisions have materially qualified—here there is a clear waiver of that right by the whole conduct of the defendants. So far as title is concerned, if they are disturbed they have their remedy at law under the covenants. The defendants must execute this lease with regard to the costs. I think certainly that the defendants having the worst of the bargain the plaintiff might very well forego them; but as he is undoubtedly in his right in pressing for them, I do not see any reason why I should exercise the discretion given me on behalf of the defendants, and as I estimate the value of this property for the remainder of the term—that is to say five years at £25 per year—that will be £125, which carries costs on the higher scale.

APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. THOMAS GUNNER, barrister-at-law, of the Western Circuit, has been appointed Recorder of Southampton, which office had become vacant by the appointment of Mr. Montague Bere, Q.C., to the recordership of Bristol. Mr. Gunner was called to the Bar at Lincoln's-inn in January, 1842, and has for some years acted as Deputy Judge of the Winchester County Court.

The Corporation of Doncaster has increased the salary of Mr. E. J. Meynell, recorder of that borough, from forty to sixty guineas per annum.

GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE.

1 & 2 VICT. c. 74—SERVICE OF NOTICE ON TENANT.

SIR,—Can any of your readers inform me if a notice served on a tenant under the Tenements Act (1 & 2 Vict. c. 74) in the following way is sufficient service?

Tenant renting under £5 per annum holds over after notice to quit having been served. The landlord proceeds to recover possession by justices' warrant under the above Act, and causes a seven clear days' notice to be served on the wife of the tenant, not on the premises, but at a neighbour's house close by, where the wife happened to be. The notice was read over to the wife of the tenant, and the purport and intent thereof explained to her. On an application to the magistrates for a warrant to give the landlord possession, it was refused on the ground that the notice was not served at the place of abode of the person so holding over. The tenant did not appear before the magistrates.

The words in the 2nd section of the Act are, "Leaving the same with some person being in, and apparently residing at, the place of abode of the person so holding over."

CONSTANT READER.

THE LEGAL, CLERICAL, AND MEDICAL CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETY (LIMITED) v. HAES.*

SIR,—My attention has been called to your report of the *Legal, Clerical, and Medical Co-operative Society v. Haes*, in your issue of Oct. 22, wherein I am described as the official liquidator of that society. I beg to inform you that I am not, and never have been, official liquidator of the said society, or in any way connected with the business of the liquidation in any other capacity than that of counsel, in which character I appeared in the before-mentioned case, retained by Messrs. Belfrage & Middleton, solicitors for the liquidator.

JOHN FINLAISON.

2, Stone-buildings, Lincoln's-inn, Nov. 1.

[It appears, therefore, that Mr. Finlaison has not been connected with the liquidation of the Legal, Clerical, and Medical Co-operative Society, beyond such relationship as may have arisen from his having been the promoter of the original society. The report in question was, with the exception of the first five lines of the statement of facts, contributed to our columns by Mr. Finlaison.—ED. S. J.]

SOCIETIES AND INSTITUTIONS.

THE METROPOLITAN AND PROVINCIAL LAW ASSOCIATION.

TUESDAY, October 11.—The annual provincial meeting of the Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association was held this year at Bristol at the Law Library, in the Assize Courts. The business arrangements were well carried out by Mr. P. Rickman, the secretary of the association, and Mr. H. F. Lawes, the local secretary. Mr. J. F. Beaver, of Manchester, the chairman of the association, presided.

THE CHAIRMAN.—We cannot, I think, open our proceedings without congratulating ourselves that we are not in a strange place among strangers, but in a city associated with some of our happiest recollections, and among old and tried friends, who require no arguments to induce their hearty co-operation in our work, and no appeal to stimulate their good will. In 1853, the eleventh year of the association, we held here our sixth provincial meeting. The originator of our autumnal readings presided, three of the papers were contributed by Bristol members, and we were most hospitably and kindly received by the local society and solicitors. After a lapse of twelve years we again come here on the invitation of our Bristol brethren, and whether we regard the promise of the programme read to us, or the reality of the kind welcome already given to us, we may, without remitting ourselves to "the region of silence and past memories," rest assured that "we might have gone further and fared worse." By one of the rules for the government of our provincial meetings, it is required that the chairman's address shall comprise a review of the proceedings of the last year. I fear that to a large extent I must honour this rule in the breach rather than in the observance, for I cannot ignore that the proceedings, so far as respects half the year, are reviewed in the last annual

report of the committee, and as respects the other half will be reviewed in the next report. I propose, therefore, to notice briefly the printed minutes of meetings held since the last annual report, and to make some cursory observations on three of them—namely, the Transfer of Land Bill of the last session, the Legal Education Association, and our own society. But in regarding the work done, it becomes me as a provincial member who has taken little part in that work not to overlook the workers; for, as in the material world, it is impossible to contemplate the creation without venerating the creator, so if we regard, however slightly, the labours of the managing committee, we must feel that we are under special obligations to its metropolitan members. If, therefore, I may be permitted on this occasion to be the mouthpiece of the association, I tender to those members our grateful acknowledgments for the care, the ability, and the conscientiousness with which they have discharged their duties, and particularly the important and peculiar duty of stimulating the inquiries, eliciting and propounding the common opinion, and combining or assimilating the exertions, not only of the provincial committeemen, but of the twenty-nine provincial law societies with whom we are associated, and whose deputations usually attending these meetings represent thousands of the solicitors of England and Wales. To the intimacy of our relations with the provincial societies and to the influences of our aggregate meetings we owe much of the representative character which enables our committee on many occasions to speak and act, not merely on behalf of our own members, but also on the behalf or with the concurrence of thousands of members of provincial societies; thus entitling us to claim a representative influence, and giving to the action of our committee when brought to bear on Parliament, or the Government, or the judicature, a force which secures us a hearing, and not unfrequently the recognition of our views, and which shows how important it is that the several provincial law societies should, by means of a central organisation, think and act in concert, rather than run the risk of conflicting in policy with each other, and neutralising by antagonistic action their respective influences.

An instance of the exercise of this function of our committee happens to be the first item which I shall notice of the minutes of committee meetings. This item states that prints of the Transfer of Land Bill had been sent to all the provincial law societies, and that from a number of them commendations had been received. A minute at the May meeting records that the list of members had been revised in accordance with a resolution passed at a previous meeting, thus certifying us that the list is what it purports to be, namely—a list of members supporting us by subscriptions, and aiding us, when occasion offers, by personal services or by correspondence. Minutes of the June, July, and August meetings are to the effect, *inter alia*, that the communications of the committee with the provincial societies on the Land Transfer Bill had been continued; that the committee had ceased to be presented to both Houses of Parliament petitions of the association in favour of the High Court of Justice and Appellate Jurisdiction Bills; that these petitions had been published in the *Law Times* and the *Solicitors' Journal*; that the petition to the House of Lords was presented by the Lord Chancellor; and that in the case of the petition to the House of Commons we had the advantage of having the petition presented by the member for Stockton-upon-Tees, one of our managing committee. The bills were ultimately withdrawn; but though we failed in the immediate object of the petitions, it is satisfactory to find that we had the concurrence of other societies, for the Lord Chancellor on the order for going into committee on the High Court of Justice Bill said, "He had received numerous applications expressing a desire that the bill should pass as speedily as possible, from mercantile bodies, from four or five large bodies of attorneys in the north, from the Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association, and from the Society for the Amendment of the Law, the resolution of this last body having been adopted at one of the largest meetings it had known, presided over by Mr. Mellish, an eminent member of the Common Law Bar."

Another minute of our managing committee shows that a petition of the association to the House of Commons, praying for numerous alterations in the Stamp Duties Bill, was also presented by the member for Stockton-upon-Tees, was printed by the House of Commons (Appendix, 849), and was published in the *Law Times* and *Solicitors' Journal*; and that subsequently the bill was "reprinted with alterations,"

* Vide 14 S. J. 963.

meeting, it was understood, the majority of the points mentioned in the petition." It also appears that on this bill the committee had corresponded with the Manchester Law Association.

And now, gentlemen, permit me a few words on the three topics I have ventured to select for further observation.

The Land Transfer Bill purported to repeal the Land Registry Act of 1862, and to make registration compulsory. Condemned by Lord St. Leonards as an immature production, calculated to endanger the rights of landowners, to promote litigation, and to increase, for the benefit of the Exchequer, the burdens on land and the expenses of land transfer, the bill was regarded with little favour. The *Times* and the *Law Magazine* warned the public to beware of it, and people who saw in it a disguised money bill preferred to "bear those ills we have than fly to others that we know not of." Happily the bill was withdrawn, and the Land Registry Act of 1862 still languishes as a dead letter in the Statute-book, and still the officers of the Land Registry are insufficiently employed. But if these evils, infinitesimal though they be in a national point of view, are, in the severe judgment of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, too grievous to be endured, let us hope that the remedial measure will come in some less questionable shape than the Land Transfer Bill of the last session. Let the Chancellor of the Exchequer, if he be really bent on diminishing the cost of land transfer extend to the public at large the immunity from stamp duties which, by the Benefit Building Societies Act, was conceded to small capitalists; or if he require that the Act of 1862 shall be made to work, let him be advised whether, without extinguishing the voluntary principle of the Act, a remedy may not be found in some cautious and well-considered modification of the Act itself—an Act which you may remember the Government of the day were sanguine enough to consider as a great measure of real property reform, and which, at the close of the session, was thus mentioned in the speech from the throne:—"The Act for rendering more easy the transfer of land will add to the value of real property, will make titles more simple and secure, and will diminish the expense attending purchases." But what said Mr. Avison, our chairman at that time? He wished that these expectations might be realised, and he prophesied, and prophesied truly, that the measure would meet with no opposition from us; but he was afraid that the cases in which the measure would be of use would be very few. Mr. Livett, of Bristol, said, "The cost of the registry office would be something like £8,000 or £10,000 a year, and, if we did not make use of it, that sum would be spent for nothing; and he was sure that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would not suffer that, and in the end the Act would be made compulsory." Why, it may be asked, did Mr. Avison anticipate that the cases in which the Act could be used would be few? And is not the answer to the question to be found in the 4th section of the Act? That section provides that application may be made for registration of title by "any purchaser of a fee simple where his contract empowers him so to do, or the vendor consents." In these few restrictive words, I apprehend, lay the cause of the failure of the Act; for, though in numerous instances purchasers would, but for these words, have found it beneficial to apply for registration, yet the cases have been few indeed in which a vendor would allow the purchaser to apply for registration or could be advised to do so, because generally the future state of the title, and the facility of future transfer, are matters with which a vendor has no concern, his object being to complete the sale at the least possible trouble and expense to himself. Had this effect of the 4th section occurred to Lord Westbury when, in 1864, he made some strictures on the failure of the Act, he would hardly, I think, have attributed that event to the hostility of conveyancers, and compared the family solicitor to "the old man of the sea" on Sinbad's shoulders. No doubt we may agree with his Lordship that, in fiction, the family solicitor and the old man of the sea are personifications of selfishness, but let us inquire what they are in fact. As to the old man of the sea, what says the learned editor of the "One Thousand and One Nights" in a note on Sinbad? He says (see vol. iii., p. 98): "It is related that, from the sea of Syria, there cometh up to the abode of men a creature in the form of a man, having a white beard, and they name it the old man of the sea, and when the people see it they rejoice in expectation of plenty." And, with regard to the family solicitor, and to his administration of

the present law of real property, permit me to quote the following passage, which expresses the opinion of Mr. Davidson, the eminent conveyancing barrister, a high, if not the highest authority on practical conveyancing, and which, as it refers to the Act of 1862, is peculiarly apposite. He says (see "Precedents in Conveyancing," third edition, 1869, vol. ii., p. 790): "That the losses by suppressed incumbrances are rare is nevertheless established by the general testimony of those who are conversant with this subject. The explanation of that immunity from risk which practically exists, and without which land must be unmarketable or nearly so, is to be found in two circumstances, namely—first, the general management of transactions relating to landed property by solicitors, a profession to whom in a matter so full of technicality, very much is necessarily confided, who are trusted by one another as well as by their clients, and to whose trustworthiness as a class society is more beholden for the orderly march of its affairs than is commonly acknowledged. And, secondly, the important part in connection with dealings with landed property which is sustained by title deeds."

The Legal Education Association is the subject of the following minute of the June meeting of our managing committee, namely:—"Read letter from the committee of the Legal Education Association, expressing their hope that the managing committee would approve of the objects that association had in view, and would nominate some of their body as members of the council of such association. Resolved, on the motion of Mr. Torr, seconded by Mr. Stephen Williams, that this meeting highly approves the objects of the Legal Education Association, and deems them worthy of the support of all who take any interest in the welfare of the profession, and that it is gratifying to this meeting to observe that fifteen members of the managing committee have already been placed upon the council of that association."

I should fail in my duty as chairman did I not in the spirit of this minute hail as fellow labourers in the great cause of legal education this important and energetic society, of which the head is the head also of the bar of England; and the council comprises, I believe, members of the governing bodies of the Juridical Society, the Society for the Amendment of the Law, and the principal law societies of the provinces, besides the fifteen committeemen of our own society.

The association has been described by the *Times* as "a body animated with a lively sense of the want of anything like satisfactory legal education," and its object is, I presume, to devise some means of supplying this want for the benefit both of students for the bar and of students for our own branch of the profession. A paper on the subject of legal education by one of the founders of our society, Mr. John Hope Shaw (whose memory we all venerate), was read in 1863 at our aggregate meeting at Leicester. In this paper Mr. Shaw said there is an intermediate stage between general literature and special training, in which a knowledge of law as a science should be acquired. This is equally necessary, he said, for barristers and solicitors, and the present system of legal education makes no provision for it in either case. These words, so far as they refer to solicitors, seem to me to suggest that a student, after taking a degree at college, or passing a preliminary examination in general knowledge, should devote a term of say two years at least to courses of study and lectures on law as a science, and should then take a degree or pass an examination in law; and that after furnishing this proof of his having acquired some knowledge of the principles of law, he should be allowed to be articulated to a solicitor for the purpose of learning the application of principles to practice, and enabling himself at the end of say a clerkship of three years, and after passing one or two intermediate examinations, to pass his final examination and be admitted. What the scheme of the Legal Education Association may be with regard to students for the bar I do not know, but I may venture to say that at this period—when the rail and the telegraph bring all mankind together, when the digest and codification of our laws are acknowledged to be necessary, and a federation of the nations of the world, and the assimilation of their several systems of law, are deemed possible—we cannot withhold our approval of the design of the association to render the jurists of our country more learned than they have been in the science of law, and especially in the principles of the Roman law, the law which has been called "the common law of nations," and which has been charac-

terised as "the highest expression of science and order in the legislation of mankind."

Thirdly and lastly, let me say a few words about our own association. The managing committee in the last annual report informed us that it continued "fairly to hold its own, and to obtain its average amount of support, notwithstanding the losses from death and otherwise which its twenty-two years of existence have brought upon us." This information is satisfactory, for though our revised list of members shows a reduction of numbers consequent on a somewhat large excision of names of members whose subscriptions had ceased, our annual income remains about the average amount; and in point of fact I find, on referring to the annual statements of account which have been published, that in eleven of the twenty-two years the annual income was less than it was in the year ending in April last, and that in the other eleven years it was greater.

With regard to numbers I have compared the last list of members with the list in 1849, when the number of members was 813. I find that while Birmingham, Bristol, Manchester, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Worcester, and York have more, and two of them—namely, Birmingham and Manchester—very considerably more members than they had in 1849, other towns have fewer members, the principal decrease being in two places, in one of which it is 125 and in the other 50; and yet nowhere more than in these two places has the society firmer, better, or more talented supporters, and nowhere in its annual congresses has it been better received or more sumptuously entertained. The cause of decrease in each of these places is, I believe, simply the result of inaction in obtaining new members to supply the places rendered vacant by the operation of natural causes; and this raises the question whether in some cases the necessity of canvassing might not be superseded by taking what are called corporate subscriptions. I observe that in the Social Science Association certain bodies are admitted as corporate members, entitled to certain privileges; I believe, too, that in our own society a similar mode of subscription has prevailed, for in the annual report for 1856, page 10, occur the words "The Bristol society has increased its subscription from £10 10s. to £21."

How the changes of organisation contemplated by the Legal Education Association may, if adopted, affect our society, I know not; I understand, however, that the council of the Legal Education Association entertain some scheme for creating out of the Inns of Court, the Incorporated Law Society, and the principal provincial societies, some new organisation which, after a period of transition, shall result in a restoration of the ancient foundations of the Inns of Court and Chancery as a national law university, of which the members shall comprise in due order classes representing the four or five thousand barristers, and nine or ten thousand solicitors of the present day, and of which the common revenues shall consist of ancient educational endowments restored to their original uses; and also, it may be hoped, of what I shall call those larger educational imposts which, in the form of certificate duties and stamps on articles of clerkship and on admissions, are levied on law students and law graduates, and are at present diverted from their proper purposes.

Should this scheme of the Legal Education Association be realised, we may not be unaffected: for on the one hand we are connected with the principal provincial law societies, and, on the other hand, there are our relations with the Incorporated Law Society. These relations could hardly be more intimate than they are, for frequently members of our committee have been members of the Council of the Incorporated Law Society, and generally the two societies have worked together as if they were one, each seeking to promote education because education is power for good, and each acting in concert, because union is strength for good.

For the present, perhaps, we may content ourselves with the reflection that members of our committee are on the Council of the Legal Education Association, and that whatever may be the result of the deliberations of the council, our duty will be to take care that the power and the strength which have hitherto constituted our force, shall continue in some form to be so used as "to promote the better administration of the law, and to protect the rights, and increase the usefulness of the profession."

And may it be found in the future, as it has been in the past, that the persons entrusted to wield that force may so wield it as to render to their order the help and ornament in which, as Lord Bacon said, every man is a debtor to his profession, and which, in this our "legal convocation,"

may be said to consist in "doing his duty in that state of life in which it has pleased God to call him."

Mr. WILLIAM SHAEN (London) proposed a vote of thanks to the chairman for his interesting address, and that it be printed and circulated in the usual way. As a member of the metropolitan branch of the profession, he thanked the chairman for the kind and handsome manner in which he had referred to the fact that upon the members in London necessarily devolved the bulk of the labour in conducting the association, and for his kind recognition of the way in which these proceedings had been conducted. It must happen that the greatest part of the work would necessarily fall upon members of the profession who resided in the metropolis, and speaking from a long experience—in fact an experience extending from the foundation of the association—that fact had not given rise to difficulties and unfriendly feelings between the metropolitan and provincial members. They had found themselves divided upon various questions, but he was sure that the real division of opinion arose from a genuine difference of belief, the result of honest and careful thinking on the part of solicitors, and whilst that was the case it was certain that those differences would show themselves wherever the members of the association honestly exerted their thought. They might therefore look upon their differences of opinion in the future, as they had in the past, with sentiments of entire gratification. The subjects discussed in the opening address were of immense importance, but he would venture to illustrate his remarks on the differences of opinion that existed, by taking exception to one statement made by the chairman. He referred to the question of land transfer; and he thought that as a profession they should examine into the merits and demerits of the existing system. It was quite clear that to maintain at an enormous expense such an institution as the existing Land Transfer Office, doing hardly any business at all, was a great mistake; it had proved to be the kind of failure anticipated by their branch of the profession. It was now an admitted failure, and they should try to find out why it was so, and whether it should be swept away, or what amendments should be introduced. The failure was traced in the address to the difficulties in setting the machinery at work; but his experience had shown him that where those difficulties did not occur the system did not work more satisfactorily. He thought the system itself was at fault, because it was partly a registration of title and partly a registration of deeds, and it was an extremely expensive system.

Mr. TORR could not endorse all that Mr. Shaen had said, for he thought the registration at the Land Transfer Office was the simplest and most easy and effective that could be devised. It should also be borne in mind that it was not compulsory, and that there were many cases in which it was desirable to register a title. It was not to the advantage, he thought, of their profession to agitate for the abolition of that office, which he believed at present was a perfectly harmless office. He had found it a convenience, and as long as the country chose to pay the expense he did not think it was politic for them to advocate its abolition.

Mr. PAYNE seconded the resolution.

Mr. ROSE did not understand that the abolition of the office had been advocated, but Mr. Shaen had given them some information as to the practical working of the system with a view to an amendment. He (Mr. Rose) was strongly opposed to the registration, as a governmental scheme for making places and increasing costs. He had advised a client that if he had a good title he should put the deeds in a box and sit upon it—and if he had a bad one not to take them to a registration office, for its defects would be discovered.

After some remarks from Mr. DIXON,

Mr. KIMBER said, with regard to disputes that might take place about boundaries, that if there were to be disputes the sooner they were settled the better. He did not think the registration office should be abolished. He had had little or no experience of the system, but he had had an experience of the American land registry, and had looked into extensive titles; he found that the American system was very good and very clear, and the process very inexpensive. With regard to the Legal Education Association, he should like that association more distinctly to set before them what they intended to do with the other branch of the profession. They were going to take greater care of the solicitors, and he hoped they would take greater care of the higher branch of the profession. He did not think that the education of the higher branch of the profession was so sound and so properly cared for as that of their own. In conclu-

sion, he congratulated Bristol upon the erection of such a very handsome building as that in which they were assembled.

Mr. MONCKTON (Maidstone) pointed out some of the practical evils of the registration system.

Mr. S. WILLIAMS (London) said, with regard to the Middlesex Registry Office, that he did not know a single instance in which an application made to the office had been beneficial to his clients. If the benefits of registration were real and substantial, he would then say—"Why has not the law of registration, which is applicable to the county of Middlesex, been extended to every county in England?" The fact that it had not been so extended showed that the Government were of opinion that compulsory registration was not beneficial, or they would have had it throughout the country.

Mr. ORRER adduced an instance showing that the expense should prevent landowners from registering a really good title.

Mr. J. MILLER had heard from agents that the farce of searching for John Smith or Thomas Jones in the London Registry Court was simply a waste of time without any result.

The CHAIRMAN said that Professor Johnson, of Birmingham, had contributed a paper affecting the question under discussion, but before proceeding further it was the rule that the place of meeting next year should be fixed upon after the disposal of the address.

Mr. HODGE then said that he was deputed by the Newcastle-on-Tyne Law Society to ask the association to meet in that town in the coming year.

Mr. ROSE proposed, and Mr. S. WILLIAMS seconded, that the offer of Mr. Hodge be accepted.

The motion was put and carried unanimously.

The SECRETARY (Mr. Rickman) then read Professor Johnson's paper on "The Transfer of Land Bill of last Session." The paper was condemnatory of the bill.

A vote of thanks was proposed to the Professor, and adopted.

Mr. TORR maintained that it would be impossible to establish a compulsory registration. The registrations established in some of our colonies, and also in the United States, were confined simply to the legal ownership, and they were like the registrations for stock of the Bank of England.

Mr. ROSE said that Professor Johnson was one of the ablest men in their profession, and attention was due to anything which he advanced; but he (Mr. Rose) took objection to the two remedies which he had suggested. He (Mr. Rose) thought the real remedy for the evils and expenses of conveyance would be the employment of such a gentleman as Mr. Brodie, who should be requested to set about remedying those acknowledged evils.

Mr. BEDELL argued that the system was expensive in the conveyance of small pieces of land, and that it was a fallacy to suppose that registration was cheap.

Mr. MOSELEY (Bristol) read a paper on "County Court Jurisdiction and Practice." Having referred to the growing importance of the courts, he advocated the introduction of a modified system of pleading. The next points were the advisability of introducing some provision from the Procedure Act, 1854, and the trial of debtors' summonses, accounts, &c., by the registrar. He had formerly expressed a very strong opinion that in actions of debt the creditors, plaintiffs in the county courts, should have the option of personally serving their debtors. His views upon this subject, however, had since been modified. The temptation to commit perjury would, in too many cases, be irresistible to fraudulently-disposed plaintiffs. His present impression was that it would, on the whole, be the lesser evil of the two to allow the service of county court summonses to rest with some responsible official. The present position of the high bailiff and his subordinates certainly required reconsideration and readjustment. With regard to jurisdiction the consideration of that subject must necessarily depend upon the prior elucidation of two problems which are now prominently before the profession—the abolition of the circuits, and the fusion of the two branches, solicitors and barristers. If the circuits were to be abolished (as to the expediency of which he offered no opinion) the county courts would become the only local tribunals. Mr. Moseley then advocated the extension of the jurisdiction to breaches of promise, seduction, slander, &c.

Mr. S. WILLIAMS proposed a vote of thanks to Mr. Moseley. In illustration of the waste of time occasioned by county

court judges disposing of questions of weekly payments, he said that on a recent visit to Bideford the learned judge, Serjeant Petersdorff, was occupied nearly the whole of the morning by such questions. The registrar of the court might, he thought, have those questions entrusted to him.

Mr. KIMBER objected to any sort of technical pleading, which, he said, would bring them back to the days when pleading was a great public wrong and evil. The more they could make their pleadings commonly and intelligently understood by the great masses of the community, the more would their profession be respected, and the more would they be entitled to honour and profit. In the present state of things he dissented from any extension of the jurisdiction of the county court judges. He had met with such gross ignorance and carelessness about detail manifested by some of them that he would be rather inclined to vote for their abolition. He was satisfied that the present system might be greatly improved by the appointment as judges of good and educated and discreet lawyers.

Mr. Clay, Mr. Shaen, and Mr. G. Taylor having spoken,

Mr. FIELD (London) said that in the necessity of things the county court was a branch of the Queen's courts. It could not be long before the county courts became in some shape or other branches of the great courts, and that the Queen would have but one sort of law courts, and would not have one court here which could do one thing and another court there which could do another thing. Whenever that came about there would be an end of so much of the difficulty as arose from the want of jurisdiction in certain cases.

Mr. ROSE thought that pleading within reasonable limits was a proper and necessary part of every court of justice, and it was no argument to say it became an abuse in olden times.

Mr. ELLETT (Cirencester) concurred in the observations of the opener of the debate as to the necessity of placing the bailiff under the control, in some way or another, of the judge of the court.

Mr. J. MILLER thought that the voice of the profession should be raised, with a view to the improving the jurisdiction of these county courts.

Mr. TAYLOR objected to exceptional legislation. The county courts should, he thought, be put on the same footing.

Mr. SAUNDERS (Birmingham) said that if the profession were to take action they should be up and doing. He had the draft of a bill which embraced the whole subject of the jurisdiction of the county courts, and enlarged the jurisdiction to an enormous extent. He thought there should be a more careful selection of judges to preside over those county courts, and they must all feel rather ashamed of a recent appointment, which was made, he thought, from political motives.

The further discussion of the paper was then adjourned until next day.

Mr. FIELD (London) explained the arrangements which it was proposed to make in the erection of the new Courts of Justice in London. The commission appointed to inquire into the law courts of other countries—and of which he was secretary—had obtained a large amount of information, and a court would be erected that would afford convenience to all who might have business to transact in it. He complained however, that no provision had been made to have a basement story.

In the course of the discussion which followed,

Mr. SHAEN said that in the Bristol Assize Court it struck him that a curious error had been committed by the architect in placing the reporters as far as it was possible to place them from the witnesses. It was very often difficult to hear witnesses, but it was important that they should be heard by the reporters, who ought almost to be considered as officers of the court.

Mr. BEDELL was glad that Mr. Shaen had called attention to the inconvenient position of the reporters' seats in the Bristol Assize Court. At the last assize the speeches of counsel could not be heard by the reporters, and were not therefore, reported.

The discussion was then directed to the proposed new court in London, and the meeting adjourned shortly before five o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, October 12.—Before the business of the meeting was resumed this morning the half-yearly meeting of the Solicitors' Benevolent Association was held in the same place. [We have already reported the proceedings.*]

The business of the Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association was then resumed.

A paper by Mr. Jevons, of Liverpool, was read, on "The High Court of Justice Bill." Any adequate measure for amalgamating the Courts of Law and Equity, Admiralty, Probate and Divorce, and fusing their separate systems, must provide for the following matters:—The comprehension in one system of all courts for the administration of justice in civil suits; the concentration and amalgamation of the offices of all courts proposed to be amalgamated by the bill; the transaction of the merely ministerial and interlocutory business of provincial suits in the localities where they arise; the hearing in the provinces of cases now the subject of equity and admiralty jurisdiction; and more frequent opportunities for trial or hearing of cases in the provinces.

Mr. WOOD (Manchester) moved a vote of thanks to Mr. Jevons, author of the paper. He hoped the time was not far distant when a man would not be debarred of his just rights because he had not taken the correct way of enforcing them.

Mr. HODGE seconded the resolution, and, with the sanction of the mover, added—that Mr. Jevons be requested to allow his paper to be printed and circulated amongst the members of the association.

Mr. FIELD drew attention to the report which the committee of the association published in April last, and which contained most of the points embraced in the paper just read.

The CHAIRMAN observed that though the paper might not meet with the concurrence of all present they were all indebted to Mr. Jevons.

The resolution was then adopted.

Mr. ROSE deprecated the union of common law and chancery, and said that what was wanted in the country was more expedition in their proceedings. More judges were required to administer the two systems of law and equity, and it was absurd that there should be only two assizes a year to try common law rights—there ought to be four or five a year, or even one every month. During an experience of thirty years he had never known a case overthrown simply because the plaintiff had made a mistake in the tribunal which he had chosen. He then severely criticised the title of the bill, and objected to it as one of the scandals which had been palmed upon the country.

Mr. BROMLEY (London) and Mr. GILL (Liverpool) read papers on "Attorneys and Solicitors' Remuneration Bill."

Mr. FIELD proposed "that both these papers be referred to the committee, to consider whether any and action should be taken on their subjects, with power to communicate with the Incorporated Law Society, and all the provincial law societies."

Mr. ROSE dissented from the principle of the papers, which was to increase the emoluments of the profession. For himself, he was perfectly satisfied with 6s. 8d., 13s. 4d., and a guinea, when he could get it; the present mode of remuneration had always paid him satisfactorily. If the public understood the question as he understood it they would never allow the change to be made in that respect, and it was a fallacy to say that it was for the benefit of the public.

Mr. KIMBER thought that many of the changes referred to were for the better.

Mr. WATSON (Newcastle-upon-Tyne) said that thoughtful men out of the profession saw the absurdity of the present state of things as well as they did themselves.

The resolution was then put and carried.

Mr. KIMBER read a paper "On the Amalgamation of the Two Branches of the Legal Profession." He contended that a wide-spread feeling existed that the present division between the two branches was a farce, and most detrimental to the interests of commerce.

The discussion upon the paper was very brief, and was taken part in by Messrs. Watson, Griffiths, Saunders, and Payne, all of whom regretted that the paper contained intemperate language affecting the bench and the bar.

The following resolutions were adopted:—"That the best thanks of this meeting be given to Mr. Ward, the president, and to the committee of the Incorporated Law Society of Bristol, for the munificent hospitality with which they have received and entertained the gentlemen who have attended from a distance."—"That the best thanks be given to Mr. Wasbrough, chairman, and Mr. Lawes, honorary local secretary, for the very efficient arrangements they had made."—"That the best thanks be given to the authors of papers read at the meeting."—"That the best thanks of this meeting be given to the master, wardens, and members of the Society of Merchant Venturers, and to Sir Wm. Miles,

Bart., for the great courtesy with which they have assisted the objects of the meeting."—"That the best thanks be given to the secretary (Mr. Rickman) for his great attention to the business of the meeting."—"That the best thanks be given to the president for his admirable address and his able conduct in the chair."

The proceedings then terminated.

Amongst those who attended the meeting were—Messrs. Beever (chairman), P. Rickman (secretary), J. Dixon, Lewis Fry, W. Shaen, E. Banner, J. H. Essell, R. A. Payne, M. Hore, A. Cox, J. W. Burrup, G. Whitcombe, W. Plumble, R. Ellett, E. C. Petgrave, G. W. Hodge, T. Avison, H. Abbott, W. Radcliffe, F. Marriott, J. S. Torr, R. S. Watson, J. C. Wallis, C. T. Saunders, J. T. Ray, E. Field, A. Ryland, I. A. Cooke, E. Bromley, E. T. Payne, W. S. Cookson, J. D. Kay, G. H. Nelson, F. H. Barr, S. Alecock, jun., H. G. Bush, H. Cooke, F. Whittuck, S. G. Cossam, J. Bush, T. Marshall, E. Wilson, A. W. Sadgrove, T. Eiffe, B. F. Hawksley, F. Filler, J. Stone, J. C. Gwynne, G. F. Prideaux, H. Livett, S. Williams, E. Kimber, B. Bedell, J. A. Rose, W. H. Guest, M. B. Wood, G. Wharton, H. G. Taylor, J. Case, H. T. Sankey, J. B. Monckton, W. Hunt, J. Heelis, T. J. Gill, P. Woolley, J. Ansdell, J. Hawdon, J. Holtby, W. Walker, &c.

THE SOLICITORS' BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION.

The usual monthly meeting of the Board of Directors of this association was held at the Law Institution Chancery-lane, London, on Wednesday, the 2nd inst., Mr. Park Nelson in the chair, the other directors present being Messrs. Burton, Field, Hedger, Rickman, Smith, and Torr (Mr. Eiffe, secretary). A sum of £105 was expended in grants to necessitous widows of deceased members of the association, and £10 in grants to non-members' widows. Three new life and twenty-one new annual members were admitted to the association.

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

At the meeting of this society held on Tuesday last, Mr. Gordon in the chair, the question for discussion was No. 459 Legal:—A. assigned the benefit of a contract to purchase real estate to C, by way of security. C gave notice to the vendor, who afterwards, disregarding the notice, conveyed to A. C, in consequence, sustained damage. Has C any remedy against the vendor?—*McCright v. Foster*, 18 W. R. 509; on appeal 18 W. R. 905. Mr. L. Hunter opened the debate in the affirmative, Mr. Stock in the negative; and, after a well-sustained discussion, the society decided the question in the negative.

HULL LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

The inaugural meeting of this society was held at the Hull Church Institute on the 20th October, the president (Mr. H. Cook) being in the chair. Several gentlemen were proposed and admitted as members of the society; and the secretary (Mr. J. O. Jacobs) read a letter from Samuel Warren, Esq., Q.C., recorder of Hull, expressing his regret at not being able to attend. The recorder made the society a valuable present of books, and a vote of thanks was accorded to him. The president then delivered an address full of sound advice to the students, who, he was glad to say, seemed to appreciate the value of a society like this: he was of opinion that it was one which the solicitors of Hull should support. Dr. A. K. Rolitt then made some remarks, in the course of which he gave a graphic description of the state of the law in America. The theory, he said, was all that could be desired, but he was sorry to say the practice was just the reverse. He also gave some amusing incidents of the practice in New York which had come under his own observation, and in conclusion urged the articulated clerks to become useful members of the profession. A vote of thanks to the president and to Dr. Rolitt was carried by acclamation.

The Commissioners of Church Temporalities in Ireland have appointed Mr. George Bernard, solicitor, of Dublin, as their Chief Clerk. Mr. Bernard was for some years officially connected with the department of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners of Ireland.

Chief Justice McKean, of Utah, has decided that the territorial legislation whereby the Mormons have for years controlled the jury system of the supreme and district courts of Utah, is null and void.—*Albany Law Journal*.

OBITUARY.

MR. W. MURRAY.

We regret to have to record the death of Mr. William Murray, an eminent city solicitor, which occurred at St. Leonards, on the 27th ult., in his seventy-fourth year. Mr. Murray served his articles in Portsmouth, of which town he was a native, and was admitted in the year 1817, when he entered into partnership with Mr. Osbaldeston, a solicitor in good practice in the city of London. The firm of Osbaldeston & Murray for many years enjoyed high repute, and continued till the retirement of Mr. Osbaldeston in 1834. From that time Mr. Murray carried on single-handed a large and increasing practice until the year 1857, when he took into partnership his son, Mr. Chas. F. Murray and Mr. Hutchins. The firm of Murray, Son & Hutchins continued until the year 1867, when Mr. Murray retired from the profession. Mr. Murray for many years previous to his retirement had a seat at the Council of the Incorporated Law Society, and was a director of the Law Life Insurance Society. In 1859 Mr. Murray was returned to Parliament for Newcastle-under-Lyme in the Conservative interest, and while in Parliament he took an active part in all questions affecting law reform, particularly in those affecting commercial law. He was a strenuous advocate for a radical reform in both the law and administration of bankruptcy, and took an active part in the committee of the House on bankruptcy law reform. His health, however, was not equal to the labours of Parliament and of his profession, and at the general election in 1865 he did not offer himself again for election. On his retirement from the profession his name was put into the Commission of the Peace for the County of Middlesex. Mr. Murray owed his great success in life and his high reputation to great ability and aptitude for business, untiring energy, high integrity, and single-mindedness of purpose, which looked only to the interests of those for whom he was concerned. He married early, but lived a widower the last thirty years of his life. He has left, besides Mr. Charles F. Murray, a son, Mr. Wm. Murray, of the Common Law Bar, and a married daughter.

MR. J. H. HACKER.

The death of Mr. John Heathcote Hacker, the senior partner in the firm of Hacker & Allen, solicitors, of Leek, Staffordshire, took place there on the 16th of October, at the age of seventy-six years. He was the second son of the late Rev. Edward Heathcote, vicar of Chesterfield, by his wife Jane, the only daughter of John Cook, Esq., of that place, and was born in 1794. He was admitted 1818, and subsequently practised at Leek. In 1840 he succeeded to the East Bridgford Old Hall Estates, in the county of Nottingham, and assumed the surname and arms of Hacker, in compliance with the testamentary injunction of his paternal uncle, Lieutenant-Colonel Rowland Heathcote Hacker, of East Bridgford. *The Leek Times* says:—"Mr. Hacker, during the course of a very long and successful practice, was distinguished for strict probity in all his transactions, and was highly respected by a large circle of clients and friends in Staffordshire and the adjoining counties." His remains were buried on the 22nd October, in the family vault at East Bridgford. Mr. Hacker was never married, and is succeeded in his estates by his only surviving brother, Rowland Heathcote, Esq., of Hatfield Manor House, near Doncaster, Yorkshire. The late Mr. Hacker was lineally descended from Colonel Francis Hacker, who served under the Parliament during the Parliamentary War, and attended King Charles I. to his execution, being, in fact, the officer to whom the warrant for that purpose was directed. He suffered as a traitor in the succeeding reign, and his estates were forfeited. A younger brother of Colonel Hacker, Rowland, served under the King during those troublous times.

MR. R. TOURNAY.

Mr. Robert Tournay, solicitor, of Ticehurst, Sussex, died on the 23rd of October, at the age of 71 years. Mr. Tournay was certificated in 1836, and for many years previous to his death had been clerk to the Ticehurst Union.

The representative body of the Irish Church have appointed Mr. John Munnell as their solicitor.

ADMISSION OF ATTORNEYS.

NOTICES OF ADMISSION.

Michaelmas Term, 1870, pursuant to Judges' Orders.

The clerks' names appear in small capitals, and the attorneys to whom articles or assigned follow in ordinary type.]

ATTER, EDWARD.—A. Helder, Whitehaven.
COWARD, CECIL ALLEN.—Griffith Thomas, Commercial Sale Rooms.
COXWELL, WILLIAM.—E. Coxwell, Southampton.
DANIEL, HENRY BEAUCHAMP.—A. Cox, Bristol.
DAVIES, JOHN TALIESIN.—J. Kempthorne, Neath.
GREEN, GEORGE.—R. D. Green, 20, Whitehall-place.
HALL, CHARLES JOHN.—J. Hall, Manchester.
HEARSEY, RICHARD.—R. A. Ward, Maidenhead; A. St. Paul, 1, Staple-inn.
HINCHLIFFE, NATHANIEL.—F. Moojen, Southampton-street.
HOULDITCH, EDWARD HOLROYD.—C. J. Follett, Exeter.
OLLARD, WALTER FARMERY.—W. L. Ollard, Upwell.
PHILLIPS, ANDREW GIBSON.—A. Phillips, Shiffnall; O. A. Ullithorne, Gray's-inn.
READ, ODDEN FREDERICK.—J. Read, jun., Mildenhall.
SAVILL, JOHN EDEN.—C. Dorman, Essex-street.
SINNOCK, HENRY CHARLES.—F. Venn, Paper-buildings.
SMYTH, THOMAS HENRY.—N. Leary, South-street.
TERRY, WILLIAM IMBERT.—W. Galsworthy, Old Jewry-chambers.
TURNER, ALLEN FREDERICK.—Marshall Turner, Lincoln's-inn-fields.
TURNER, WILLIAM.—W. T. Middleton, Stone; R. W. Litchfield, Newcastle-under-Lyme.
WATTS, ALFRED AUGUSTUS.—W. R. Archer, Lowestoft.

Michaelmas Vacation, 1870.

BROWNE, LEONARD DRAGE.
CHARLTON, JOHN CHARLES.—H. C. Fox, Plymouth; W. Adams, Plymouth.
DAVIES, RICHARD.—J. H. Hill, 23, Throgmorton-street.
GOULD, GEORGE DOMETT.—R. W. Head, Exeter.
WALKER, EDWARD ROBINSON.—J. J. P. Moody, Scarborough; R. Rowell, Manchester.

Last day of Michaelmas Term, 1870.

BADGER, ARTHUR SIDNEY.—J. Moody, Derby.
BOYES, WILLIAM OSBORN.—J. Pilgrim, Church-court, Lotherbury.
CATHERALL, EDWARD.—C. Gammon, 13, Barge-yard-chambers.
COX, CHARLES HENRY.—J. L. Grover, King's-bench-walk.
CURTIS, WILLIAM.—G. M. Wetherfield, Basinghall-street; J. P. May, 2, Prince's-street, Spital-square.
DEAN, CHARLES FREDERICK.—J. Taylor, Bradford.
FRIEND, ARCHIBALD GEORGE MACKENZIE.—G. Robins, 70, Lincoln's-inn-fields.
HENSON, FREDERICK WILLIAM.—H. Cook, Kingston-upon-Hull; W. Watson, Hedon-in-Holderness; T. Hudson, Kingston-upon-Hull.
HOWARD, GEORGE BRIGGS.—T. B. Howard, Dudley; and J. P. Mutton, 11, Great James-street.
LORD, THOMAS.—S. R. Pattison, 50, Lombard-street.
MATER, FRANCIS CREED.—W. Keary, Stoke-upon-Trent.
ROBINSON, RAISBECK WELFORD.—J. H. Bolton, 1, New-square.
STANTON, JOHN.—E. D. Stanton, Chorley.
VERNON, JOHN.—J. Morris, 6, Old Jewry.
WILLIAMS, DAVID THEODORE.—E. Scott, Wigan.

(For former names see Vol. 14, p. 700.)

NOTICES OF APPLICATIONS TO TAKE OUT OR RENEW ATTORNEYS' CERTIFICATES.

November 26, 1870.

Adams, Francis Cadwallader, 1 Hampstead Lane.
Aldrich, Frederick, Worthing, and 21, Northumberland Place, Bayswater.
Appleton, William, 39, Albert Street.
Battcock, John, 7, Vale Place, West Kensington.
Bayley, Arthur Octavius, 25, Great Russell Street, and 26, Sutherland Street.
Beckett, Henry Hugh, 12, Clarendon Square, Somers Town.
Blink, George Samuel, 21, Claremont Square.
Brown, Frank Clarke, Croydon and Neath.
Catchpole, William Smith, Louth.
Clarke, Henry William, Sevenoaks.

Cowdell, Charles Hugh, St. Bees, Dorchester, and Clifton.
 Crompton, Henry Dickinson, Edgbaston.
 Crosse, Robert Frederick, South Norwood, Maida Hill, and Ilfracombe.
 Dalrymple, William Charles, 62, St. John's Park.
 Danson, Henry Richard Cobden, Birkenhead and Liverpool.
 Fry, Peter William, 9, Gray's Inn Square.
 Goodwin, William Henry, Hastings.
 Groves, William, 45, Guildford Street, and Richmond.
 Harris, Richard, 66, College Place, and 34, Bedford Square.
 Harrison, Alfred, 75, Upper Kennington Lane.
 Harrison, David, jun., 352, Kennington Road, and Twickenham.
 Hart, Percival, 9, Belsize Park, Putney, and Tulse Hill.
 Hawes, James, Edmonston.
 Joseph, George Solomon, 43, Upper Bedford Place.
 Judge, William Gibbard, 4, Sussex Road Holloway, and Peterborough.
 Lauder, John Gilbert, Herne Hill.
 Lowe, Charles Fredk., 21, Northumberland Place, and Romford.
 Lowe, Richard, 40, Shakespeare Road.
 Lunn, Robert, jun., 10, Westbourne Park Terrace, and 33, Albert Street.
 Mains, James, 6, Springfield, Wandsworth.
 Massey, William Thomas, 40, Claverton Street, and 83, Charlwood Street.
 Moore, George, Richmond.
 Morgan, John, 74, Belsize Road.
 Newall, George Fergus, Castlehold, Newport, and 94, Wimpole Street.
 Powle, Alfred, Slough.
 Poynder, Alfred, 2, Cresswell Park, Blackheath.
 Randall, Thomas, Melbourne, and 42, Notting Hill Square.
 Read, David, 9, Barnard's Inn, and 55, Gloucester Street, Queen's Square.
 Roker, George, 63, Stanley Street.
 Scale, Martin, Neath, Glamorganshire.
 Smith, George Archer, Ordsall, 112, Lancaster Road, 121, New Kent Road, and 73, St. George's Road.
 Sole, William Anslow, 25, Baker Street, Lloyd Square.
 Sutton, Stephen Bidgood, 7, Euston Grove, and Liverpool.
 Taylor, William, New Brighton and Liverpool.
 Turner, Thomas, Nottingham.
 Turner, William Rawson, Barking and Landor Terrace, Wood Green.
 Twist, George Francis, 38, Bloomfield Street, W.
 Underwood, Arthur Griffith, 3, Wilton Terrace, and 32, Hereford Road.
 Wannop, William Jenkin, Broadwath and Hay.
 Wash, Frederick Charles, 8, Adelaide Road.
 Williams, Charles William, Sheffield.

COURT PAPERS.

COURT OF CHANCERY.

CAUSE LIST.

Michaelmas Term, 1870.

Before the LORD CHANCELLOR and the LORDS JUSTICES.

Appeals.

Clemow (Pauper) v Geach (J.—March 22)
 Mc Crea v Holdsworth (J.—March 25)
 The Merchant Banking Co. of London (Limited) v Maud (J.—March 28)
 Fries v Coke (J.—March 31)
 Marine Investment Corporation v Havaside (J.—April 1)
 Dugdale v Meadows (J.—April 7)
 Cooper v Cooper (S.—April 21)
 Weston v Weston (R.—April 21)
 Tennant v Trenchard (J.—April 23)
 Denny v Hancock (M.—April 26)
 In re Bosworthen and Penzance Consols United Mining Co. (Limited) and Companies Acts, 1862 and 1867, appl petn from the Vice Warden of the Stannaries (April 28)
 In re The Same (ditto)
 Dicoonson v Talbot (S.—May 3)
 Forester v Read (S.—May 4)
 Dean v Bennett (J.—May 6)
 Alexander v Mills (R.—May 7)
 Wildes v Dudlow (M.—May 9)
 Grand Junction Canal Co. v. Shugar (R.—May 10)
 Crickmore v Freestone (R.—May 13)
 Imperial Mercantile Credit Association (Limited) v Coleman (M.—May 17)
 Same v Same (M.—May 17)
 Mawson v Fletcher (R.—May 30)
 Bayapoole v Collins (J.—June 1)
 Edwards v Smith (R.—June 1)
 In re The Agriculturist Cattle Insurance Co. & J. S. Wind-up-up Acts, 1848, 1849 and 1857 (Bush's case) appl mota (R.—June 7)

Jegon v Vivian (R.—June 3)
 Watts v Kelson (R.—June 7)
 Davies v Price, Acraman v Price (J.—June 8)
 Hopgood v Parkin (R.—June 9)
 Mack v Postle (S.—June 10)
 Bent v Cullen (J.—June 11)
 Caldwell v Cresswell (M.—June 11)
 Hazell v Barker (M.—June 20)
 Boreham v Hall (S.—June 21)
 Fisher v Pease (R.—June 21)
 Laws v Milo (R.—June 22)
 Hatton v Wicks (R.—June 22)
 Wicks v Hatton (R.—June 22)
 Crook v Hill (S.—July 1)
 In re The Great Wheel Busy Mining Co. & Companies Act, 1862, appl petn from the Vice Warden of the Stannaries (July 7)
 Watkins v Matthews (M.—July 11)
 Deeley v Forshaw, appeal from the Vice-Chancellor of the County Palatine of Lancaster (July 11)
 Warrick v Queen's College, Oxford (R.—July 11)
 Marsden v Harrison (J.—July 11)
 Marsden v Harrison (J.—July 11)
 Greenhow v Price (R.—July 11)
 Phillipsen v Gibbon (M.—July 16)
 Roberts v Roberts (S.—July 16)
 Lambes v Eames (M.—July 18)
 Shackleton v Shackleton (J.—July 19)
 Springett v Jennings (R.—July 21)
 Johnson v Hookham (R.—July 25)
 Wilkinson v Dent (R.—July 28)
 Blunt v Blunt (R.—July 29)
 Coultras v Swan (S.—July 29)
 Betts v Willmott (J.—Aug. 12)
 Pryse v Stanton (J.—Aug. 26)
 Pearson v Dolman (J.—Sept 8)

Before the MASTER OF THE ROLLS.

Causes, &c.

The Merchant Taylors Co. v The Attorney-General demr Ormerod v Rostron f c (not before Nov. 30)
 Atherley v The Isle of Wight Ry. Co. & City Bank m d Meryett v Martin m d Lloyd v Thomas m d witnesses before examiner Clark v Revill c, wit (day to be fixed)
 Barrett v Mulberry f c Sawyer v The Peterborough Gas Co. c, wit (day to be fixed)
 Pickworth v France m d Whitworth v Whitworth m d Lazenby v White cause (day to be fixed)
 Joyce v Rawlins c, wit (Nov. 4)
 Pilcher v Rawlins ditto Watkins v Thomas m d Pearson v Miller f c Jarvis v Allen, Allen v Jarvis f c & s to vary Watson v Brandon c Chancellor v Chancellor f c Hobson v Roberts f c Hobgen v Neale f c Bristowe v Tweed c, wit (day to be fixed)
 Benney v Tank f c Rickman v Johns f c In re James Price's Estate, Price v Price f c Palmer v Jones m d Bate v Robins f c & s to vary Wooding v Wooding c

Before the Vice-Chancellor SIR JOHN STUART.

Causes, &c.

The Credit Foncier & Mobilier of England v The London, Chatham & Dover Ry. Co. demr Malone v Wallwork c Johnson v Jowitt f c Webb v Baker c, wit (2nd cause day)
 Weller v Daniels c (Nov. 11)
 Bird, pauper, v Bull c, wit (3rd cause day)
 Thompson v Morgan c (2nd cause day)
 Westmorland v Holland m d Major v Major m d Holland v Wood m d Brown v Wing m d Batchelor v Heath m d Hodson v Hodson m d Nightingale v Nightingale m d (1869.—N.—25)
 Nightingale v Nightingale m d (1869.—N.—3)
 Nightingale v Nightingale m d (1869.—N.—45)
 Bowes v The Ecclesiastical Commissioners for England m d Tyler v Yates m d Young v Waters m d Ferd v Brown m d Ormond v Ormond m d Croesley v Ingham m d Day v Thomas c Latham v Holden m d Bailey v Milman c Colman v Gregory m d Thomas v Williams m d

Blakeway v Partridge m d
 Barlow v Pool m d
 Smith v Child c
 The United Land Co. (Limited)
 v North m d
 Brocklesby v Munn m d
 Ladyman v Grave m d & sums
 Moysey v Stuart sp c
 Champney v Burland m d
 Woollacott v Sennett m d
 Muschamp v Coombes m d
 Nightingdale v Nightingale
 m d (1869.—N.—30)
 Mills v The Northern Ry. of
 Buenos Ayres Co. (Limited)
 m d
 Le Strange v Partridge m d
 Cust v Lady Middleton f c
 The Merchants' Co. (Limited)
 v Barber m d
 Provost v Mendham m d
 Colmer v Ede m d
 James v Ellis c
 Frampton v Hunt c
 Best v Donmall m d
 Murray v Hunter m d
 Bennett v Harfoot m d
 Ramsay v The Great Northern
 Railway Co. m d
 Nation v Diamond m d
 Brader v Kirby c, Collins v
 Brader m d, rehearing
 Head v Awey m d
 Armstrong v Timperon f c &
 s to vary

Before the Vice-Chancellor Sir RICHARD MALINS.

Causes, &c.

The Oriental Inland Steam Co.
 (Limited) v The Secretary of
 State in Council dem of the
 Secretary of State, pt hd
 (Nov. 7)
 Same v Same dem of Scinde
 Railway Co. (Nov. 7)
 Stacey v Simmons dem
 Richmond v De Bergrie dem
 The International Bank (Li-
 mited) v Gladstone m d (wit
 before examiner)
 Earl Beauchamp v Winn c,
 wit (day to be fixed)
 Lee v The Lancashire & York-
 shire Ry. Co. c, wit (day
 to be fixed)
 Shaw v Shaw c, pt hd
 Trevelyan v Attorney-Gen. c
 Nixey v Roffey c
 Levinstein v Wenham c,
 evidence viva voce at hearing
 De Witte v Denne c, wit (day
 to be fixed)
 Vaughan v Baldwin f c
 Brown v Williams m d and
 pet
 The North Eastern Ry. Co. v
 Watson c, wit (day to be
 fixed)
 Wright v Pitt m d
 Heard v Pilley c, wit (day to
 be fixed)
 Simpson v Heaton's Steel &
 Iron Co. (Limited) m d
 Jefferys v Marshall m d
 Hepworth v Hepworth m d,
 pt hd
 Hunter v Walters m d
 Curling v Walters m d
 Darnell v Hunter m d
 Roberts v Shearwood m d
 Lawson v The Tewkesbury
 & Malvern Ry. Co. m d
 Key v Trafford m d
 Jenkins v Lewis m d
 Morgans v Roberts m d
 Wilson v Leigh m d
 Ryde v Marks m d
 Bargo v Baldwin c, wit
 (day to be fixed)
 Niven v Aleock m d
 Prichard v Prichard m d
 Rutherford v Scott m d
 Clark v Henry m d

Hawkins v Gale f c
 Browne v Lea f c
 King v King f c & s to vary
 Montague v Robertson m d
 The Furness Iron and Steel Co.
 (Limited) v Ross m d
 Lewis v Styles m d
 Thomas v Richardson f c
 Silvester v Gough m d
 Speight v Walton m d
 Maunsell v Maunsell f c
 Griffin v Morgan f c
 Barlow v Bailey m d
 Murphy v Morgan m d
 Williams v Williams f c
 Porter v Porter m d
 Parbury v Watson f c
 Fish v Rivers m d
 Burley v Saint m d
 Cobbold v O'Malley m d
 Taylor v Rogers f c
 Pedley v Clays c
 Reynolds v Burns m d
 Busch v Jarvis, Orrell v Busch
 f c
 Dakers v Nelson m d
 Wilson v Wilson c
 Hadfield v Adlington f c
 Williams v Games f c
 Chidgey v Whitby f c
 Ashpield v Denton f c
 Bruff v Cobbold m d
 Blaydes v Blaydes c
 Pole v Begbie f c
 Jewsbury v Howell m d (short)

Critchley v Naylor m d
 Browning v French f c
 Ward v Ward c
 Blake v Clarke m d
 Lloyd v Pugh f c
 In re E. W. Lloyd's Estate f c
 Evans v Pugh f c
 Swan v Price f c
 Godfree v Kinnear m d (short)
 Rushworth v Walden f c
 Bethune v Fleming m d
 Ogilvie v Ogilvie f c
 Carter v Miller c
 Gartside v Mellor f c
 Vander Byl v Austin m d
 Tottenham v Long c
 Moore v Moore f c
 Plume v Weston f c
 Castle v Fox f c & s to vary
 Spurling v Overton m d
 Wainwright v Patten m d

Hunt v Hunt f c
 Dence v Dixon c
 Kidman v Kidman sp c
 Hemming v Maddick m d
 Lister v Warburton c
 Whittemore v Whittemore f c
 Addison v The London & South
 Western Bank (Limited) m d
 The Oriental Financial Cor-
 poration (Limited) v Overend,
 Gurney & Co. (Limited) m d
 Pemberton v Barnes m d
 Harris v The Whitehaven,
 Cleator, and Egremont Ry.
 Co. c
 Hunt v Muriel m d
 Shelton v Ashby m d
 Kidd v Pettingell m d (short)
 Hudson v Taylor c
 Gwilt v Kerr f c

Before the Vice-Chancellor BACON.

Causes, &c.

Anderson v Pignet dem
 The Worcester Park Building
 Co. (Limited) v Hector
 exors for insufficiency
 Girdlestone v The North
 British & Mercantile Insur-
 ance Co. exors for insuffi-
 ciency
 Pears v Laing m d
 Stamp v Anderson c
 Anderson v Stamp c
 The Grover and Baker Sewing
 Machine Co. v Wilson trial
 by jury
 Oakley v Sennett m d
 The Grover and Baker Sewing
 Machine Co. v Wilson m d
 Hoffmann v Postill trial before
 the Court without a jury
 Williams v The Llanelli
 Railway & Dock Co. m d
 Gould v Gould f c & petn
 The Liverpool Marine Credit
 Co. (Limited) v Read c,
 wit (day to be fixed)
 Berry v Morell c, wit (day to
 be fixed)
 James v Jones c
 Lewthwaite v Waterlow c, wit
 pt hd (day to be fixed)
 Dunn v Fowler m d (wit-
 nesses before examiner)
 Kilbey v Haviland m d
 The Tawd Vale Colliery Co.
 (Limited) v Berry c (with
 Berry v Morell) by order
 Beet v Beet m d
 Finney v Godfrey m d trial
 by jury
 Graham v Cole m d
 Roskell v Whitworth m d
 Knapp v Knapp m d
 Robertshaw v Firth m d
 Brunel v Brunel m d
 Pearce v Scudds m d
 Lycott v The Stafford and Ut-
 toxeter Ry. Co. m d
 Highett v Dampier m d
 Ingram v Upperton c, wit,
 (day to be fixed)
 Messer v Stacey c
 Bleackley v Hall m d
 Greene v The West Cheshire
 Ry. Co. m d
 Dawson v Robinson sp c
 Murray v Clayton m d
 Holdsworth v Bromley c
 Phipps v Berridge m d
 Heyman v Dubois m d
 Murchison v Batters m d
 Smith v Gibson sp c
 Hall v Hargreaves c, wit (day
 to be fixed)
 Earle v Appleyard m d
 Howard v Howard m d
 Hickman v Bentley m d
 Kemp v The South Eastern
 Ry. Co. m d

Grosvenor v Bentley m d
 Brandon v Hume m d
 Carter v Earl Ducie m d
 Palmer v Flower sp c
 Hurst v Johnson m d
 Savage v Snell sp c
 Wade-Gery v Handley m d
 Charlton v Charlton m d
 Bond v Milbourn m d
 The New Bowson Deep Coal
 Co. (Limited) v Jackson m d
 Ramsey v Hooper m d
 Deffries v The Metropolitan Ry.
 Co. m d
 The London & Paris Hotel Co.
 (Limited) v Mainwaring m d
 Johnson v The Dudley & West
 Bromwich Banking Co. m d
 Ashby v Bernard c
 Chudleigh v Wood m d
 Hayward v Penny m d
 Doughty v Whiting f c
 Pitts v The Kingsbridge High-
 way Board m d
 Soudder v Hebb m d
 Stacey v Messer c
 Ford v Foster m d
 Harrison v Good m d
 Hooper v Webb c
 Phillips v Phillips f c (short)
 Quick v The British Mutual
 Investment Co. (Limited)
 m d
 Ridler v Dunn and Others m
 d pro confesso against defend-
 ant Penniston Dunn, wit
 before exmr.
 Nowell v Nowell f c
 Stamer v Wright m d
 Cadman v Cadman sp c
 Shellam v Lister c
 Davies v Thomas m d
 Upmann v Elkan m d
 Allones v Elkan m d
 Barnaby v Tassell sp c
 Ashton v Illidge m d
 Illidge v Ashton m d
 Heath v Heath m d
 Iles v Williams m d
 Brown v Taylor f c
 Costerton v Worship m d
 Inray v Ineson sp c
 Valle v Clippindale m d
 Hunt v Sidney f c
 Wilson v Tucker m d
 Chester v Chester f c
 Chatfield v Chatfield c
 Ridgeway v The Tottenham
 & Hampstead Junction Ry.
 m d
 Gilbert v Bowen c
 Dixon v Cross m d
 Attorney-General v The Bo-
 rough of Birmingham m d
 Moser v Tall m d
 In re Giscard's Estate f c
 Jarvis v Giscard f c
 Harris v Ekins m d

Edmunds v. Jones c
Paul v. Children m d
Telford v. Allen m d
Kaye, Bart. v. The London &
North Western Ry. Co. c
Overton v. Cutbill m d
Ralfe v. Hawthorne c (1869.—
R.—68
Rennie v. Morris c
Ralfe v. Hawthorne c (1869.—
R.—61
Baylis v. Tilsley c
Palmer v. Hoare m d
Anderson v. Anderson m d
Turner v. Brasnett f c (short)
Williams v. Pearn f c

BRECON ELECTION PETITION.

Watkins and Another, Petitioners, v. Holford, Respondent.

A petition from Brecon, alleging specifically a payment of money, was filed at the Common Pleas Rule Office on Tuesday last.

This is the first petition filed under section 6 and clause 2 of the Elections Act, which directs that upon a specific allegation of payment of money or other reward having been made by any member, or on his account, or with his privity, since the return made to the Clerk of the Crown, the petition shall be presented within twenty-eight days after the date of such payment.

Agents for the petitioners, Messrs. Wyatt & Hoskins, Parliament-street, S.W.

Agents for the respondent, Messrs. Carlisle & Odell, 8, New-square, Lincoln's-inn, W.C.

COURT OF PROBATE,

AND

COURT FOR DIVORCE AND MATRIMONIAL CAUSES.

Sittings in and after Michaelmas Term, 1870.

Trials before the Court.

Nov. 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24.

The causes in the Court of Probate will be taken first.

Trials by Jury.

Nov. 25, 26, 30; Dec. 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 16, 17, 21, 22.

The causes in the Court of Probate will be tried first unless otherwise ordered.

The judge will sit in chambers for summonses at eleven o'clock, and in court for motions at twelve o'clock, on Nov. 8, and on each succeeding Tuesday until Dec. 20, inclusive.

All papers for motions must be left with the clerk of the papers before two o'clock on the Thursday before the motion is to be heard.

ADMIRALTY COURT.

This court will sit at Westminster on Tuesdays, Nov. 15th, 22nd, and 29th, and Dec. 6th and 13th, at 10.30 a.m., for summonses and motions in chambers; and at 11 a.m. for motions in court; and on every week day to Friday, Dec. 16th, to hear causes.

ARCHES COURT.

This court will sit at Westminster on Monday, Nov. 7, and on such other day or days as may be appointed by the judge.

THE BRISTOL BANKRUPTCY COURT.—By an order of the Lord Chancellor, gazetted on the 14th October, the pending business of the late District Court of Bankruptcy at Bristol was, on the 31st ult., transferred from Mr. Alfred John Acraman, late official assignee of that court, to the registrar of the Bristol County Court. The Lord Chancellor has allowed Mr. Acraman to retire upon his full pension, in consideration of his lengthened servitude of nearly twenty-eight years, having been appointed official assignee of the Bristol Court of Bankruptcy on the 14th of November, 1842.

COPYRIGHTS.—We note some of the more important provisions of the "Copyright laws of the United States, as revised, Consolidated, and Amended by act of Congress, approved July 8, 1870." Term of copyright twenty-eight years, may be renewed for the further term of fourteen years. Entries must be made, hereafter, with the Librarian of Congress. Duplicate copies of the work copyrighted must be deposited in the mails, addressed to the Librarian within ten days after publication. Copyrights may be assigned, by instrument in writing, and the assignment must be recorded in the office of the Librarian within sixty days or become void. Appeals and writs of error lie to the United States Supreme Court, from all judgments, decrees, etc., regardless of the amount in controversy.—*Western Jurist.*

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

LAST QUOTATION, Nov. 4, 1870.

From the Official List of the actual business transacted.)

| | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 3 per Cent. Consols, 93½ | Annuities, April, '85 |
| Ditto for Account, Dec. 1, 93½ | Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1903 |
| 3 per Cent. Reduced 91½ | Ex Bills, £1000, — per Ct. 10 p m |
| New 3 per Cent., 91½ | Ditto, £500, Do — 10 p m |
| Do. 3½ per Cent., Jan. '94 | Ditto, £100 & £200, — 10 p m |
| Do. 2½ per Cent., Jan. '94 | Bank of England Stock, 4½ per |
| Do. 5 per Cent., Jan. '73 | Ct. (last half-year) 23½ |
| Annuities, Jan. '80 — | Ditto for Account, |

INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

| | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| India Stk., 10½ p Ct. Apr. '74, 208 | Ind. Inf. Pr., 5 p Ct. Jan. '73 100 |
| Ditto for Account | Ditto, 5½ per Cent., May, '79 107½ |
| Ditto 5 per Cent., July, '80 112½ | Ditto Debentures, per Cent., |
| Ditto for Account, — | April, '64 — |
| Ditto 4 per Cent., Oct. '88 100½ | Do. Do, 5 per Cent., Aug. '73 103 |
| Ditto, ditto, Certificated, — | Do. Bonds, 4 per Ct., £1000 20 p m |
| Ditto Enfaced Ppr., 4 per Cent. 91 | Ditto, ditto, under £1000, 20 p m |

RAILWAY STOCK.

| Shrs. | Railways. | Paid. | Closing prices. |
|-------|---|-------|-----------------|
| Stock | Bristol and Exeter | 100 | 89 |
| Stock | Caledonian | 100 | 77 |
| Stock | Glasgow and South-Western | 100 | 110 |
| Stock | Great Eastern Ordinary Stock | 100 | 39½ |
| Stock | Do., East Anglian Stock, No. 2 | 100 | 90 |
| Stock | Great Northern | 100 | 132½ |
| Stock | Do., A Stock | 100 | 139½ |
| Stock | Great Southern and Western of Ireland | 100 | — |
| Stock | Great Western—Original | 100 | 71½ |
| Stock | Lancashire and Yorkshire | 100 | 132 |
| Stock | London, Brighton, and South Coast | 100 | 42½ |
| Stock | London, Chatham, and Dover | 100 | 13½ |
| Stock | London and North-Western | 100 | 125 |
| Stock | London and South-Western | 100 | 90 |
| Stock | Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln | 100 | 46 |
| Stock | Metropolitan | 100 | 63 |
| Stock | Midland | 100 | 127½ |
| Stock | Do., Birmingham and Derby | 100 | 96 |
| Stock | North British | 100 | 34 |
| Stock | North London | 100 | 116 |
| Stock | North Staffordshire | 100 | 38½ |
| Stock | South Devon | 100 | 48 |
| Stock | South-Eastern | 100 | 76 |
| Stock | Taff Vale | 100 | 165 |

* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

INSURANCE COMPANIES.

| No. of shares | Dividend per annum | Names. | Shares. | Paid. | Price per share. |
|---------------|--------------------|----------------------------|---------|---------|------------------|
| 5000 | 5 pc & bs | Clerical, Med. & Gen. Life | 100 | 10 0 0 | 21 2 6 |
| 4000 | 40 pc & bs | County | 100 | 10 0 0 | 85 0 0 |
| 34440 | 5 pc & bs | Eagle | 50 | 5 0 0 | 6 0 0 |
| 10000 | 7½ 2s 6d pc | Equity and Law ... | 100 | 6 0 0 | 7 11 3 |
| 20000 | 7½ 2s 6d pc | English & Scot. Law Life | 50 | 3 10 0 | 5 0 |
| 2700 | 5 per cent | Equitable Reversionary... | 105 | ... | 93 0 0 |
| 4600 | 5 per cent | Do. New | 50 | 50 0 0 | 45 0 0 |
| 5000 | 5 & 3 psh b | Gresham Life | 20 | 5 0 0 | 0 |
| 20000 | 5 per cent | Guardian | 100 | 50 0 0 | 51 10 0 |
| 20000 | 5 per cent | Home & Col. Ass., Limtd. | 50 | 5 0 0 | 3 2 6 |
| 7500 | 10 per cent | Imperial Life | 100 | 10 0 0 | 16 12 6 |
| 60000 | 12 per cent | Law Fire | 100 | 3 10 0 | 3 2 6 |
| 10000 | 3½ p cent | Law Life | 100 | 53 17 6 | 49 12 6 |
| 00000 | 10 per cent | Law Union | 19 | 0 10 0 | 0 17 6 |
| 20000 | 5½ 17s 6d pc | Legal & General Life ... | 50 | 8 0 0 | 9 0 0 |
| 20000 | 4½ 12s 6d pc | London & Provincial Law | 50 | 4 17 8 | 4 11 3 |
| 40000 | 26 per cent | North Brit. & Mercantile | 50 | 6 5 0 | 23 3 0 |
| 2500 | 12½ & bus | Provident Life | 100 | 10 0 0 | 34 10 0 |
| 89220 | 20 per cent | Royal Exchange... | Stock | All | £318 |

MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

The impetus imported to the markets by the fall of Metz was not at first sustained. Gradually, however, all the markets recovered their improved tone, and the week closes with consols rising, the railway market firm, and foreign securities in brisk demand at slightly improved prices.

The Court of Common Council has increased the salary of Mr. W. Corrie, Remembrancer to the City of London, from £1,500 to £1,800 per annum. Mr. Corrie was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in June, 1836, and was formerly a member of the Northern Circuit.

Judge Barnard, in charging the grand jury of over and terminer, in New York, the other day, said: "I presume this Court

will have to be in almost continuous session until such time as this generation shall have passed away, so that the vast majority of men now engaged in the commission of crime shall either be incarcerated, run away, or dead. I use the word generation, because history tells us that after every great war it requires a generation to clear out the bad men that have grown bad as camp followers, swindlers, and robbers."—*Albany Law Journal*.

Some young men in the town of — having "out up" one night to the detriment of certain windows and bell-pulls, were lodged in the calaboose, and in due time next morning confronted before a police magistrate, who fined them five dollars each, and gave them an admonition. One of the three foolishly remarked: "Judge, I was in hopes you would remember me, I belong to the same lodge with you!" The Judge, apparently surprised, replied, with brotherly sympathy: "Ah! is it so? Truly, this is brother—! I did not recognise you. Excuse me for my dulness. Yes, we are brother Masons, and I should have thought of that. Mr. Clerk, fine our brother—ten dollars. Being a Mason, he knows better the rules of propriety than other men! Fine him ten dollars. You will pay the clerk, brother —. Good morning, my dear brother. Call the next case."—*Chicago Legal News*.

ESTATE EXCHANGE REPORT.

AT THE MART.

Oct. 26.—By Messrs. Fox & Bousfield.

A freehold property, embracing an area of 1,050ft., situate No. 1, Gower-place, and No. 20, Wells-place, Leman-street, White-chapel, let at £31 14s. per annum. Sold £385.

By Messrs. Furber, Price & Co.

No. 23, Horton-street, Kensington, term 32 years, ground rent £5, unlet. Sold £680.

Oct. 27.—By Messrs. Vigers.

An extensive area of land, and buildings, situate near the terminus of the Midland Railway, and known as King's-cross Market, a printing house and office, and two houses in Stainton-terrace; the premises are held for a term of 87 years, at a ground rent of £240 per annum. Sold £19,700.

Also the undivided half share of a copyhold property, known as the Grove, Kingsbury, Middlesex, with residence, farm buildings, and 93a. 1r. 29p. Sold £55,000.

Also No. 1A, Hugh-street, Pimlico, held for an unexpired term of 56½ years, at a rent of 2s. per annum, also a piece of freehold land in the rear, let at £10 per annum. Sold £510.

By Mr. Geo. Beckett.

A house and shop, situate at No. 38, Alpha-terrace, Kilburn-lane, also coach-house and stable in the rear, held for a term of 87 years, at a ground rent of £5, rental £68. 4s. Sold £500.

Also No. 10, Park-road, West Brompton, term 80 years, at a ground rent of £8 per annum. Sold £410.

By Mr. Ward.

A freehold public-house, known as the Royal Oak, No. 1, Chapel-street, Stockwell, together with a house and shop adjoining. Sold £2,600.

By Messrs. Hards, Vaughan, & Co.

A freehold and part copyhold estate, situate at Cherry Hinton, near Cambridge, comprising residence, outbuildings, and 35 acres of pasture land. Sold £5,400.

Also a freehold cottage, known as Anchor Cottage, situate at Lewisham, and let at £24 per annum. Sold £360.

Nov. 1.—By Messrs. Farebrother, Clark & Co.

A freehold farm of 170 acres, known as Coombe-house Farm, in the parishes of Bolney and Twineham, Sussex, with house, homestead, and out-buildings—sold £3,550; also a freehold plot of 12a. 0r. 26p., situate as above, and suitable site for the erection of a residence—sold £600; also a freehold house, No. 310, Walworth-road, let at £32 per annum—sold £590; also 312, Walworth-road, freehold, let at £52 per annum—sold £990; also 314, Walworth-road, freehold, let at £40 per annum—sold £840; also a freehold ground rent of £24 per annum, arising out of Nos. 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, Olney-street, Walworth—sold £480; also a ditto of £5, from No. 1, Olney-street—sold £105; also a ditto of £20 from Nos. 3, 5, 7, 9, and 11, Olney-street—sold £420; also a ditto of £5 from No. 13, Olney-street—sold £105; also a ditto of £24 from Nos. 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, and 24, Olney-street—sold £520; also a ditto of £20 from Nos. 15, 17, 19, 21, and 23, Olney-street—sold £420; also a ditto of £12 from Nos. 25, 26, and 28, Olney-street—sold £250; also a ditto of £22 10s. from Nos. 350, 352, and 354, Walworth-road—sold £530; also a ditto of £22 10s. from Nos. 356, 358, 360, Walworth-road—sold £600; also a ditto of £5 12s., a moiety, from Nos. 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, and 16, Montpelier-street—sold £100; also a ditto of £8 16s., a moiety,

from Nos. 28, 30, 32, and 34, Princes-street, Walworth-road—sold £160; also a ditto of £11 4s., a moiety, from 16 houses numbered from 66 to 96, Olney-street, even numbers—sold £200; also a ditto of £5 12s., a moiety, from Nos. 59 to 64, Olney-street, even numbers—sold £100; also a ditto of £2 4s., a moiety, from 49 and 51, Olney-street—sold £40; also a ditto of £10, a moiety, from 25 houses, Nos. 53 to 83, Olney-street, odd numbers—sold £220; also a ditto of £5 2s., a moiety, from 34, 36 and 38, Olney-street—sold £90; also ditto of £16 16s., a moiety, from 41, 43, 45, and 47, Olney-street—sold £130; also a ditto of £9 10s., a moiety, from 40, 42, 44, 46, and 48, Olney-street—sold £205; also a ditto of £2 12s., a moiety, from 30 and 32 Olney-street—sold £50; also a ditto of £7, a moiety, from 27, 29, 31, 33, and 35, Olney-street—sold £140; also a ditto of £13 4s., a moiety, from 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, and 26, Princes-street, Walworth-road—sold £270; also a ditto of £3, a moiety, from 1, Montpelier-street—sold £60.

By Messrs. Ellis & Son.

Freehold houses, being Nos. 103, 104, 105, and 106, Tooley-street, the Unicorn-yard, and chapel, a small cottage and three plots ground, occupying an area of 8,000 superficial feet—sold £2,520.

AT GARRAWAY'S COFFEE HOUSE.

Oct. 26.—By Messrs. J. Walker & Sons.

The lease of the Mercers' Arms public-house, at the corner of Mercer and Castle-street, Long-acre, held for 17 years at £85 10s. per annum. Sold £1,660.

Also No. 18, Spencer-road, Wandsworth-road, and a plot of ground adjoining, term 87 years, net rental £59. Sold £810.

Also No. 20, adjoining, and let at £65 per annum. Sold £830.

Also No. 22, a detached villa residence, term 88 years, net rental £65. Sold £860.

Nov. 1.—By Mr. F. J. Sharp.

A freehold ground-rent of £6, arising from a villa at South Norwood-hill—sold £190; also a freehold ground rent of £10, arising from a villa in the same neighbourhood—sold £255; also a ditto of £10, from another villa as above—sold £260; also a ditto of £15, from another villa as above—sold £365; also Nos. 239 and 241, Queen's-road, Dalston, term 54 years, net rental £76—sold £830; also Nos. 235 and 237, Queen's-road, Dalston, same term, and let at same rentals—sold £835.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

DUCKWORTH—On Oct. 29, at 38, Bryanston-square, the widow of Herbert Duckworth, Esq., barrister-at-law, of a son.

HELLARD—On Nov. 1, the wife of Alexander Hellard, Esq., solicitor, Portsmouth, of a daughter.

HOLBERTON—On Oct. 30, last, at Brierley-hill, Staffordshire, the wife of J. L. Holberton, solicitor, of a son.

LAWSON—On Nov. 2, at 9, The Grove, Blackheath, the wife of William Norton Lawson, Esq., barrister-at-law, of a daughter.

ROWCLIFFE—On Oct. 31, at 20, Sussex-place, Regent's-park, the wife of William Rowcliffe, Esq., of a daughter.

MARRIAGES.

TUCK—ATHERTON—On Oct. 27, at the Church of St. Michael and All Angels, Paddington, George Hustler Tuck, barrister-at-law, to Agnes Margaret, eldest daughter of the late Sir William Atherton, M.P., Attorney-General.

DEATHS.

BROWNE—On Oct. 28, at The Park, Nottingham, John Rogers Browne, Esq., solicitor, aged 47.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Professional Partnerships Dissolved.

TUESDAY, Nov. 1, 1870.

Conquest, John Carrington, and Wm Stimson, Bedford, Attorneys and Solicitors. Oct. 26.

Vizard, Wm, Geo Augustus Crowder, Alfred Anstie, & Thos Bristows Young, Lincoln's-inn-fields, Attorneys and Solicitors. Oct. 31.

Winding up of Joint-Stock Companies.

TUESDAY, Nov. 1, 1870.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Baughparah Tea Estate Company of Assam (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented Oct. 25, directed to be heard before Vice-Chancellor Bacon on Nov. 5. Lumley & Lumley, Old Jewry-chambers, solicitors for the petitioner.

London Suburban Bank (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented Oct. 29, directed to be heard before the Master of the Rolls on Nov. 12. Chidley, Old Jewry, solicitor for the petitioner.

North Middlesex Waterworks Company (Limited).—Petition for winding up, presented Oct. 25, directed to be heard before Vice-Chancellor Bacon on Nov. 5. Flux & Co., East India-avenue, solicitors for the petitioners.

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

FRIDAY, Oct. 28, 1870.

Andrews, John, Modbury, Devon, Esq. Jan 1. Andrews, Modbury.
Appold, Maria, Brighton, Sussex, Widow. Jan 2. Wordsworth & Co.
South Sea House, Threadneedle-st.
Brown, Thos, Munster-st, Regent's-park, Butcher. Dec 1. Le Riche &
Son, King's-rd, Bedford-row.
Carter, H, Woodford, Essex, Draper. Dec 1. Jones & Co, Queen-st,
Chesapeake.
Fisher, Thos, Manch, Auctioneer, Dec 6. Rowley & Co, Manch.
Gammon, Wm, Spencer-rd, New Wandsworth, Builder. Dec 14. Barn-
nard & Co, Lancaster-pl, Strand.
Granville, Thos Wm Hinchliff, Bexhill, Sussex, Esq. Dec 9. Booty &
Butt, Raymond-bldg, Gray's-Inn.
Greene, Joan, Great Berkhamsted, Hertford, Widow. Dec 1. Wood-
roffe, New-sq, Lincoln's-Inn.
Gully, Wm Algernon Slade, Trevenen, Cornwall, Esq. Dec 1. Shilson
& Co, St Austell.
Garney, Emma, Clifton-rd, St John's-wood, Widow. Nov 21. Clark,
Lincoln's-inn-fields.
Hockley, Jas, Salisbury, Wilts, Servicingman. Nov 30. Hodding,
Salisbury.
Ibberson, Richard, Manch, Stonemason. Dec 6. Rowley & Co, Manch.
Ingram, Geo, Barton-upon-Humber, Lincoln, Brick Manufacturer. Jan
1. Mason, Barton-upon-Humber.
Marshall, David, Llandiloes, Montgomery, Innkeeper. Dec 10. Williams,
Llandiloes.
Mason, Wm, Oldham, Lancashire, Tailor. Dec 31. Ponsonby, Oldham.
Matthew, John, Box Hill, Surrey, Esq. Jan 1. Cattarns & Co, Mark-
lane.
Matthieson, Augustus, St Bartholomew's Hospital, Professor of Chemis-
try. Dec 15. Wild & Barber, Ironmonger-lane, Cheapside.
Mundy, Chas Wm, Barking, Essex, Painter. Nov 21. Blewitt, New
Broad-st.
Pilkington, Rev. Chas, Stockton, Warwick. Dec 27. Haymes & Co,
Leamington.
Pyes, Lucinda Ann, Tattenhall, Chester, Widow. Dec 1. Forshaw &
Hawkins, Lpool.
Taylor, Godfrey, Alderminster-rd, Bermondsey, Lieut. H.M. Navy. Dec
1. Sharpe & Co, Bedford-row.
Webb, Nancy, Tottenham-st, Kensal Newtown, Widow. Nov 21. Cor-
bett, Worcester.
Wilson, Jas Lodge, Maidstone, Kent, Surgeon. Dec 31. Cursham, Not-
tingham.

TUESDAY, Nov. 1, 1870.

Adams, Fras Bryant, Cannon-st, Esq. Nov 30. Wordsworth & Co,
South Sea House, Threadneedle-st.
Bendlow, Joseph, Ecclefield, York, Gent. Dec 14. Brown & Son,
Sheffield.
Blackman, Wm, Rolvenden, Kent, Yeoman. Nov 25. Hinds, Goud-
hurst.
Butler, Thos Wm, Ratcliffe-on-Trent, Nottingham, Farmer. Dec 31.
Martin, Nottingham.
Chetwynd, Hy, Brighton, Sussex, Esq. Dec 20. Hand, Stafford.
Cooper, John, Manston, York, Secretary. Dec 1. Rider, Leeds.
Gale, Hy, Chippenham, Wilts, Ironmonger. Dec 1. Pinniger & Wood,
Chippenham.
Hague, Wm, Cranbrook, Kent, Gent. Nov 25. Hinds, Goudhurst.
London, Constance, Clapham-rd, Spinster. Nov 30. Reyroux &
Phillips, Cannon-st.
Marshall, David, Llandiloes, Montgomery, Innkeeper. Dec 10. Williams,
Llandiloes.
Pratt, Fredc Thos, Doctors'-commons, Esq. Dec 20. Bockett & Son,
Lincoln's-inn-fields.
Roberts, Isabella, Camden-rd-villas, Widow. Dec 25. Routh & Stacey,
Southampton-st, Bloomsbury.
Roberts, John, Camden-rd-villas, Victualler. Dec 25. Routh & Stacey,
Southampton-st, Bloomsbury.
Shaw, Robert, Hunslet, Leeds, Millwright. Dec 1. Middleton & Son,
Leeds.
Stevenson, Helen, Stockwell-pl, Stockwell, Widow. Dec 2. Richards,
Warwick-st, Egent-st.
Stevenson, Thos, Vauxhall Bridge-rd, Westminster, Carman. Nov 17.
Elliott, Vincent-sq, Westminster.
Stovell, Wm, Douglas-rd, Canonbury, Gent. Nov 30. Hill & Hoyle,
Canon-st.
Williams, John, Cheltenham, Gloucester, Coal Merchant. Jan 1.
Griffiths, Cheltenham.
Wright, Constantine, Malvern-rd, Dalston, Surgeon. Dec 17. Wansey
& Bowen, Moorgate-st.!

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, Oct. 28, 1870.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Brown, Robt, Smith-st, Mile End, Draper. Pet Oct 13. Brougham.
Nov 14 at 1.
Scott, Wm Jas, Fenchurch-st, General Merchant. Pet Oct 21. Roche.
Nov 14 at 12.

To Surrender in the Country.

Cane, Wm, Gillingham, Kent, Licensed Victualler. Pet Oct 24. Ac-
worth. Rochester, Nov 10 at 11.
Dickinson, John Gladwin, New Wandsworth, Auctioneer. Pet Oct 25.
Willoughby. Wandsworth, Nov 10 at 10.30.
Dunkley, Geo, Birm, Builder. Pet Oct 25. Welford. Birm, Nov 18
at 10.
Harvey, Hy Wightman, West Gorton, nr Manch, Leather Cloth Manu-
facturer. Pet Oct 27. Kay. Manch, Dec 1 at 9.30.
Keller, Conrad, Huntspill, Somerset, Watchmaker. Pet Oct 26. Lovi-
bond. Bridgwater, Nov 9 at 2.
Short, Geo, Warrington, Lancashire, Builder. Pet Oct 24. Nicholson.
Warrington, Nov 9 at 11.

TUESDAY, Nov. 1, 1870.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Biddis, Alfd, Lismore-rd, Kentish Town, Beer Retailer. Pet Oct 27.
Brougham. Nov 15 at 12.
Hayward, Wm, St Mary Axe, Spice Merchant. Pet Oct 27. Brougham.
Nov 17 at 11.30.
Phillips, Wm Jas, Easton-rd, Auctioneer. Pet Oct 29. Brougham.
Nov 15 at 1.
Shepherd, Benj, King and Queen-st, Walworth, Victualler. Pet Oct 31.
Brougham. Nov 17 at 11.

To Surrender in the Country.

Chalklin, Geo, Penze, Surrey, Licensed Victualler. Pet Oct 27. Row-
land. Croydon, Nov 8 at 2.
Childer, Wm, Audley, Stafford, Joiner. Pet Oct 29. Challinor. Hanley,
Nov 12 at 11.
Clarke, John Silvester, Helston, Cornwall, Merchant. Pet Oct 29. Chil-
cott. Truro, Nov 15 at 3.
Cunningham, John Usher, & John Grahame, Lpool, Cotton Brokers.
Pet Oct 31. Watson. Lpool, Nov 14 at 2.30.
Davies, John, Llandilo, Carmarthen, General Merchant. Pet Oct 29.
Lloyd. Carmarthen, Nov 11 at 1.
Flerey, Chas, Duckington, Oxford, Seed Merchant. Pet Oct 29. Dudley.
Oxford, Nov 19 at 12.
Harvey, Hy Wightman, West Gorton, Oil Cloth Manufacturer. Pet Oct 27.
28. Kay. Manch, Dec 1 at 10.
Henderson, Robt, & Thos Bell, Chatham, Kent, Drapers. Pet Oct 27.
Acworth. Rochester, Nov 12 at 11.
Horsham, Fras, Stoke Devonport, Devon, Market Gardener. Pet Oct 29.
Pearce. East Stonehouse, Nov 16 at 11.
Purdon, Hy, Hirwaun, Glamorgan, Surgeon. Pet Oct 27. Rees. Aber-
dare, Nov 16 at 11.
Roberts, Wm, Hengapel, Carnarvon, Farmer. Pet Oct 29. Jones. Ban-
gor, Nov 12 at 2.
Russell, Geo Lewis, Shorncliffe Camp, Lieut 3rd Buffs. Pet Oct 31.
Callaway. Canterbury, Nov 15 at 2.
Ward, Jas, Lpool, Bottle Salesman. Pet Oct 27. Watson. Lpool, Nov
16 at 2.
Waters, Geo, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Grocer. Pet Oct 29. Skinner.
Wolverhampton, Nov 14 at 12.
Winn, Wm, Lpool, Draper. Pet Oct 27. Watson. Lpool, Nov 14 at 11.

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

TUESDAY, Nov. 1, 1870.

Taylor, Benj, Chadderton, Lancashire, Iron Turner. Oct 28.

Liquidation by Arrangement.

FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

FRIDAY, Oct. 28, 1870.

Baylis, Hy John, Wimbledon, Draper. Guildhall Tavern, Gresham-
st, Nov 16 at 12. Smith & Co.
Bellis, Hy, Chester, Contractor. Nov 15 at 3. William Churton, East-
gate-bldgs, Chester.
Bellis, Robt., Chester, Joiner. Nov 15 at 2. William Churton, East-
gate-bldgs, Chester.
Burditt, Eliz., Woodbridge, Suffolk, Watch Maker. Guildhall Coffee-
house, Gresham-st, Nov 14 at 12. Welton, Woodbridge.
Chapman, David, Wells-next-the-Sea, Norfolk, Coal Merchant. Nov
12 at 12. Stanley, Bank-plain, Norwich.
Clamp, John, Erdington, Warwick, Car Proprietor. Nov 9 at 3.
Wright & Marshall, Birm.
Collins, Edwd Fredk, Milton-terrace, Wandsworth-road, Draper. Nov
11 at 11. Mardon, Newgate-st.
Cooke, Geo, Birm, Brewer. Nov 15 at 3. Powell, Temple-st, Birm.
Cooke, John, West Buckland, Devon, Farmer. Nov 11 at 10. Friend,
Post Office-Chambers, Queen-st, Exeter.
Counpland, Geo Fredk, and John Buck Spence, Old Broad-st, London,
and Lpool, Merchants. Offices of Turquand & Co, 16, Tokenhouse-
yd, Nov 14 at 12. Elmalle, Forsyth, & Sedgwick, Leadenhall-st.
Davis, Chas, Taunton, Brewer. Nov 14 at 11. Wotton & Co, Taunton.
Davis, John, Windsor-st, Putney, Corn Merchant. Nov 13 at 12. Smith
& Co, Broad-st, Cheapside.
De Vecchi, Silvio Eugenio, Gt Winchester-st-bldg, Merchant. Guild-
hall Coffee-house, Gresham-st, Nov. 24 at 12. Abrahams & Roffey,
Old Jewry.
Dodd, Jas, Byker, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Quarryman. Nov 9 at 2.
Hoyle & Co, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
Fillery, Richd Jun, Hensfield, Sussex, Miller. Nov 14 at 2. Woods &
Dempster, Brighton.
Fletcher, Edwd, Bishopwearmouth, Durham, Coal Trimmer. Nov 9 at
3. Bell, Sunderland.
Foden, Eliz, Blackden, Sandbach, Chester, Innkeeper. Nov. 12 at 10.
Cooper, Congleton.
Girdlestone, Robt., Banningham, Norfolk, Miller. Nov 12 at 11. Stan-
ley, Norwich.
Gould, Edmund, Red Lion-ct, Watling-st, Lace Agent. Nov 23 at 12.
Cattlin, Grocers'-hall-ct, Poultry.
Hall, John, Sheffield, York, Grocer. Nov 5 at 12. Tattershall, Sheffield.
Harbridge, Rebt, Dudley, Worcester, Grocer. Nov 11 at 11. Stokes, Dud-
ley.
Hodges, Thos, Taunton, Somerset, Baker. Nov. 3 at 11. Trenchard
Taunton.
Hogarth, Ralph, Camden-grove, Peckham, Solicitor's Clerk. Office
of Harrison & Potts, New-Inn, Strand. Nov 12 at 2. Fain, Win-
stanley-road, Clapham Junction.
Harcornb, Elijah, Nottingham, Shoes Dealer. Nov 14 at 12. Heath,
Nottingham.
Illingworth, Wm, and Joshua Hemingway, Bowling, York, Staff Manu-
facturers. Nov. 1 at 2. Hatchinson, Bradford.
Jeffery, Thos, Lawrence-lane, Comm Agent. 145, Cheapside, Nov 14
at 3. Mason, Gresham-st.
Jones, John, Swansea, Glamorgan, Ironmonger. Nov 11 at 11. Clifton,
Swansea.
Knight, Jas, Birm, Timber Merchant. Nov 8 at 12. Jelf & Gouls,
Birm.

- Laundy, Hy, and Patrick Robinson, Sh. field, York, Woollen Merchants. George Hotel, Huddersfield, Nov 7 at 12. Binney & Son, Sheffield.
- Leeworthy, John, Bristol, Licensed Victualler. Nov 8 at 11. Beckingham, Bristol.
- Leigh, Thomas, Warrington, Lancaster, out of business. George Hotel, Salford-street, Warrington, Nov 11 at 12. Cobbett & Co, Manch.
- Levy, Chas David, Aldgate, Merchant. Guildhall Tavern, Gresham-st, Nov 23 at 3. Solomon, Finsbury-place.
- Lewis, Rees, and Chas Victor Westin, Cardiff, Clothiers. Offices of Bernard & Co, 4, Crookherbtown, Cardiff, Nov 11 at 2. Stephens, Cardiff.
- Lloyd, Richd, gen., Warrington, Lancaster, Builder. Nov 10 at 11. Davies & Brook, Warrington.
- Locker, Wm, Farnham, Surrey, China Dealer. Nov 19 at 2. Pittman, Spanford-st.
- Mantle, Jas, Bristol, Draper. Nov 9 at 1. Press & Inskip, Bristol.
- Marrow, Fredk Rushton, and John Thorley Threlfall, Lpool, Ship Brokers. Offices of Gibson & Bolland, 10, South John-st, Lpool, Nov 14 at 3. Whitley, Lpool.
- Martin, John, Maidstone, Kent, Cabinet Maker. Offices of Hart & Co, 67, Moorgate-st, Nov 7 at 12, Cooke & Talbot.
- McCauley, Denis, Carlisle, Cumberland, Innkeeper. Nov 10 at 11. Wamop, Carlisle.
- Mennell, Thos, Jdn, Stockport, Chester, Coal Merchant. George Hotel, Wellington-road, Stockport, Nov 14 at 11. Bachelor, Queen-st, Cheapside.
- Messer, Geo, Bath, Painter. Nov 8 at 11. Bartrum, Bath.
- Miffler, Saml, Ashton-under-Lyne, Lancaster, Quarryman. Nov 14 at 4. Darnton, Ashton-under-Lyne.
- Mills, Simon, Walsall, Stafford, Embosser. Nov 11 at 3. Duignan & Co, Walsall.
- Morgan, Morgan, Swansea, Glamorgan, Butcher. Nov 11 at 2. Morris, Swansea.
- Page, Saml, Cornwall-ter-mews, Regent's-pk, Coachman. Offices of Mr Thos Beesley, 14, Bedford-row, Nov 11 at 12. Daniel, Chancery-lane.
- Phillips, Isaac Fredk, Grove-place, Acton, Clerk. Nov 2 at 12. Cattlin, Grocers'-hall-ct, Poultry.
- Phillips, Jesse, Cardiff, Glamorgan, Outfitter. Barnard & Co, 4, Crookherbtown, Nov 10 at 2. Davis, Cardiff.
- Pontey, Wm, York, Nurseryman. Nov 9 at 2.30. Sykes, Huddersfield.
- Porter, John, Blackpool, Lancaster, Ale Merchant. Ball Hotel, Preston, Nov 16 at 3. Leigh, Manch.
- Sim, Wm, Lydd, Kent, Carpenter. Nov 14 at 2. Stringer, New Romney.
- Smith, Sarah Eliz, Leeds, Milliner. Nov 10 at 12. Granger, Leeds.
- Smith, Walter Hy, Isleworth, Middx, out of business. Nov 7 at 2. Terrell & Chamberlain, Basinghall-st.
- Standeven, Thos, Halifax, York, Bookseller. Nov 10 at 3. Thomas, Halifax.
- Stephens, Edmund, Taunton, Grocer. Offices of Wotton & Co, 28, East-st, Taunton, Nov 11 at 11.
- Taylor, Wm, Hulme, Butcher. Nov 15 at 11. Mann, Manch.
- Trigg, John, Tewkesbury, Gloucester, Baker. Nov 9 at 12. Moores & Romney, Tewkesbury.
- Wighton, W. A., Dawlish, Devon, Draper. Royal Clarence Hotel, Exeter, Nov 10 at 3. Force & Battishill, Exeter.
- Williams, Alfd Edwd, Colchester, Essex, Florist. Red Lion Hotel, Colchester, Nov 7 at 11.
- Worrall, Chas, Birmingham, Fruiterer. Nov 9 at 11. Allen, Birm.

TUESDAY, NOV. 1, 1870.

- Andrews, Fredk Vigne, Mimcing-lane, Cotton Broker. Offices of Quilter & Co, 3, Moorgate-st, Nov 15 at 3. Druce & Co.
- Beckmann, Louis Carl, & Mitford Barne Burnett, Gt St Helen's, Merchants. Offices of Maynard & Co, 55, Old Broad-st, Nov 15 at 3. Rhodes & Co, Chancery-lane.
- Beech, Joseph, Wigan, Lancaster, Glass Dealer. Nov 22 at 3. France, Wigan.
- Bent, Edward Stanley, Altrincham, Chester, Attorney. Offices of Thos Walton Gillibrand, 56, George-st, Manch, Nov 16 at 3. Evans, Manch.
- Bentley, Wm Mitchell, Edgeworth, Lancaster, Shopkeeper. Nov 14 at 2. Winder, Bolton.
- Blackshaw, Chas, Sunderland, Durham, Upholsterer. Nov 14 at 11. Hines, Sunderland.
- Boatman, Hy Edwin, Cowley-pl, Cowley-rd, Brixton, late a Collector. Offices of Fredk Coker, 32, Cheapside, Nov 8 at 3.
- Bricknell, Augustus Lea, Warwick, Engineer. Shakespeare Hotel, Stratford-upon-Avon, Nov 19 at 12. Warden, Stratford-upon-Avon.
- Brotherston, Walter, Stafford-ter, Fulham-rd, Grocer. Nov 14 at 4. Kisch, Wellington-st, Strand.
- Bramfit, Geo, & Wm Mounsey, Burley-in-Wharfedale, York, Builders. Nov 11 at 3. Simpson, Leeds.
- Chadwick, Thos, Disley, Chester, Cotton Spinner. Nov 23 at 11. Mann, Manch.
- Chapman, Thos, Southminster, Essex, Butcher. Nov 17 at 3.
- Chary, Emilie, Huddersfield, York, & Tom Swallow, Eiland, York, Woollen Cloth Merchants. Queen's Hotel, Huddersfield, Nov 14 at 11. Milnes.
- Crook, John, Clayton, nr Manch, Manufacturing Chemist. Nov 14 at 3. Sale, Shipman, Seddon & Sale, 29, Booth-st, Manch.
- Crickshank, John, York, Dealer in Horses. Nov 7 at 3. E. Stanley Bent, Bridge-st, Manch.
- Delby, Robert Eastham, Monkwearmouth Shore, Sunderland, Chemist. Queen's Hotel, Fawcett-st, Sunderland, Nov 11 at 11. Kidson, Sunderland.
- Davis, Wm Hy, East Stonehouse, Devon, Brush Manufacturer. St George's-hall, East Stonehouse, Nov 15 at 12. Curteis, East Stonehouse.
- Dixon, Thos, Birkenhead, Chester, Draper. Nov 21 at 3. Forshaw & Hawkins, Sweeting-st, Lpool.
- Doan, Thos Michael, Halifax, York, Physician. Nov 11 at 12. Wavell, Fairbriek, Foster & Wavell, George-st, Halifax.
- Downey, John, Victoria Wharf, Nine Elms, Brick Merchant. Nov 21 at 3. Nash, Fick & Layton, Suffolk-lane.
- Eardley, Thos, Bath-st, Curran-rd, Dealer in Cotton Waste. Nov 15 at 2. Halse, Trustram, Philpott & Co, 61, Cheapside.
- Empson, Fredk, Birm, Architect. Nov 11 at 11. Turlston, 36, Temple-st, Birm.
- Field, Hy, Brompton, nr Chatham, Kent, Victualler. Nov 14 at 12. Hayward, High-st, Rochester.
- Goringe, Geo Hy, Brighton, Sussex, Builder. Nov 11 at 3. Woods & Dempster, 61, Ship-st, Brighton.
- Gregon, Jas, Samle-bury, nr Preston, Lancashire, Farmer. Nov 18 at 11. Plant & Abbott, 5, Cannon-st, Preston.
- Hart, Hy, Brighton, Sussex, Closed Upper Manufacturer. Offices of Smith, Fawdon & Low, 12, Broad-st, Cheapside, Nov 16 at 12. Lamb, Brighton.
- Holland, Wm, North Woolwich, Licensed Victualler. Hall of New-inn, Strand, Nov 15 at 2. Pawle & Fearon.
- Hornblow, Wm, Manch, Hosier. Nov 11 at 3. Lawrence, Plews & Co, 14, Old Jewry-chambers, London.
- Johnson, John Wm, Portsea, Hants, Messman. Nov 11 at 11. King, 20, Union st, Portsea.
- Jones, Josiah Ellis, Longton, Stafford, Earthenware Manufacturer. North Stafford Railway Hotel, Stoke-upon-Trent, Nov 10 at 3.30. Young, Longton.
- Jordan, Jas, Folkestone, Kent, Job Master. King's Arms Hotel, Sandgate-rd, Folkestone, Nov 15 at 3. Minter, Folkestone.
- Kemsley, John, Brighton, Sussex, Boot Maker. Nov 14 at 2. Emanuel, 5, Austin Friars.
- Lander, Joseph Seth, Eastleigh, Hants, Builder. Nov 15 at 1. Kilby, 4, Portland-st, Southampton.
- Mayes, Thos, Be ford, Boot Maker. Nov 15 at 3. Conquest, Duke-st, Bedford.
- McCracken, Fras, Birm, Picture Frame Maker. Nov 18 at 12. Powell, Clarendon-chambers, Temple-st, Birm.
- Moore, Uriah, Bath, Somerset, Ironmonger. Nov 11 at 12. Simmons & Clark, Minvers-st, Bath.
- Mosley, Chas Hy, Int, Manch, Brush Manufacturer. Nov 11 at 12. Rowley, Page & Rowley, Clarence-bldgs, Booth-st, Manch.
- Mounsey, Wm, sen, Leeds, Cloth Manufacturer. Nov 11 at 3. Upton, East Farade, Leeds.
- Mounsey, Wm, jun, Yeaddon, York, Cloth Manufacturer. Nov 19 at 11. Pullan, Bank-chambers, Park-row, Leeds.
- Moyle, Geo, Manch, Hosier. Nov 14 at 11. Heywood, Dickinson-st, Manch.
- Ogden, Abel, Little Bolton, Lancashire, Joiner. Nov 16 at 3. Dutton, Acrefield, Bolton.
- Patterson, Geo Thos, Dudley, Worcester, Licensed Victualler. Nov 15 at 11. Stokes, Priory-st, Dudley.
- Perrin, Edwd Evans, Paternoster-row, Warehouseman. Chamber of Commerce, Cheapside, Nov 11 at 12. Marsden, Friday-st.
- Quiggin, Thos, Birkenhead, Cheshire, Boot Dealer. Nov 10 at 2. Downham, Market-st, Birkenhead.
- Rawley, Edwin John, & Wm Rhodes, Borough High-st, Southwark, Hop Merchants. Bridge House Hotel, Borough, Nov 23 at 3. Simpson, Borough High st, Southwark.
- Saunders, Evelyn Wigton, Lewisham, Kent, Licensed Victualler. Bridge House Hotel, Wellington-st, Borough, Nov 9 at 2. Scard, Great St Helen's.
- Savile, Hon Rev Philip Yorke, Methley, York. Nov 17 at 3. Teale & Appleton, Trinity-st, Leeds.
- Seed, Joseph, & Benj Crawshaw, Stacksteads, Rossendale, Lancashire, Ironfounders. Nov 14 at 3. Watson, Broad-st, Bury.
- Sendell, Wm, Exeter, Wood Carver. Castle-st, Exeter, Nov 16 at 11. Toby.
- Slack, Joseph, Brighouse, York, Wire Drawer. Offices of Alexander Atkinson, Kirkgate, Bradford, Nov 19 at 11.
- Sloss, Edwd, Swansea, Glamorgan, Draper. Harris & Taylor, Merthyr Tydfil, Nov 14 at 1.30.
- Smith, Geo Robt, Brompton-rd, Funeral Furnisher. Nov 17 at 12. Taylor, Hoare, & Taylor, Gt James-st, Bedford-row.
- Smith, John, Bakewell, Derby, Joiner. Cuts, Low-pavement, Chesterfield, Nov 16 at 3.
- Smith, Wm, and Wm Dawson, Northampton, Shoe Manufacturers. Chamber of Commerce, Corn Exchange-parade, Northampton, Nov 7 at 4. Beale, Market square, Northampton.
- Thatcher, Geo, Brighton, Sussex, Stationer. Nov 15 at 3. Woods & Dempster, Ship st, Brighton.
- Thomas, Arthur Frank, Aston, Warwick, out of business. Office of Hy Tyrrell, 14, Gray's-inn sq, Nov 15 at 3. Bridges & Clarke.
- Weatherald, Geo, Wallsend, Northumberland, Ale Merchant. Offices of Kidd, Britton, and Kenney, Royal-arcade, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Nov 10 at 12.
- Weston, Alfd Hy, Kennington-rd, Lambeth, Chandeller Manufacturer. Offices of Holmes & Holmes, Finsbury-pl South, Nov 17 at 3.
- Wilkinson, Edwin, Westfield, Nottingham, Clerk. Offices of Marshall & Son, Chalgate, East Retford, Nov 15 at 11. Bescohy, Retford.
- Wiseman, John, Burnley, Lancaster, Joiner. Nov 18 at 11. Hartley, Hargreaves st, Burnley.
- Withers, Saml, Oswestry, Salop, Confectioner. Guildhall, Oswestry, Nov 15 at 3. Mounford, Oswestry.

GRESHAM LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY, 37, OLD JEWRY, LONDON, E.C.

SOLICITORS are invited to introduce, on behalf of their clients, Proposals for Loans on Freehold or Leasehold Property, Reversions, Life Interests, or other adequate securities.

Proposals may be made in the first instance according to the following form:—

PROPOSAL FOR LOAN ON MORTGAGES.

Date.....
Introduced by (state name and address of solicitor)
Amount required £
Time and mode of repayment (i.e., whether for a term certain, or by annual or other payments)
Security (state shortly the particulars of security, and, if land or buildings, state the net annual income).
See what Life Policy (if any) is proposed to be effected with the Gresham Office in connection with the security.

By order of the Board,
F. ALLAN CURTIS, Actuary and Secretary.